LEO N. LEVI

MEMORIAL VOLUME

LEO N. LEVI
I. O. B. B.
1905

PRINTED BY
HAMBURGER PRINTING CO.
63-69 MARKET STREET,
CHICAGO, ILL.

E184
.J5h63

1636F15
Smyth7

Copy

TO THE MEMORY OF

LEO N. LEVI,

A leader safe and sane, a thinker erudite and profound, an orator unexcelled in his generation, a man good and true, a distinguished citizen of the United States, and an ideal Jew, this volume is dedicated by his admiring and sorrowing brethren,

THE INDEPENDENT ORDER OF B'NAI B'RITH.

INTRODUCTION.

The rendition of tribute to worth or greatness, is an attribute of advanced civilization, and in plastic marble, or responsive bronze, shaped by master hands, grateful Commonwealths often offer willing homage to their illustrious dead.

But the imposing statue also perpetuates the memory of the gifted artist, whose wondrous skill endows the lifeless material with majesty, dignity, and the expressive lineaments of the human form divine.

And thus the creator of the testimonial shares the fame of him, whose achievements are thereby commemorated.

But a loyal Brotherhood offers a more unique memorial of its affection and regard for its inspired chieftain.

It has sought no aid from the cultured imagination of mechanical proficiency of stranger or friend, but has designed a monument, every part of which, from base to summit, is fashioned from material supplied by the intellect and industry of him it attempts to honor.

Upon these pages, the sayings of a man born to lead, and fruitful in accomplishment, are faithfully transcribed. They bear incontrovertible testimony to the thoroughness and profundity of his knowledge; the wide range of his culture; his invincible logic; his faultless diction; his mastery of every subject he studied.

They reveal his breadth of mind; his freedom from prejudice; his buoyant optimism; his broad cosmopolitanism, as well as his unfaltering patriotism and devotion to his country.

They chronicle his constant, sympathetic regard for the ailing

and dependent of his own race; his exalted conception of duty; his consecration of his strongest efforts to the best interest of humanity at large; his fealty to the faith of his fathers; and his unswerving allegiance to the beneficent Order he so conspicuously led to victory and success.

It is singular that a man so lavishly gifted with the higher qualities of intellectual and moral manhood,—strikingly fitted to win distinction in the most exalted of official stations; qualified to direct the policy of governments; and equal to any responsibility which might be imposed upon him by his country,—did not, at any time, seek political preferment, or make any demands upon the suffrages of his fellow-man.

Neither the glittering baubles, nor the substantial advantages of wealth had for him any allurements; he valued money, not as the end of effort, but solely as a means of doing good, and would not devote his time nor energies to its mere accumulation.

The plaudits of the multitude never instilled in him ambition for place or power; never tempted him to swerve from the pathway to the goal which was his ultimate aim. He was never dazzled by the seductive zeal of the theorist, but always safe and sane, he deliberately selected his field of duty, and within its environments there was none to excel him.

Gradually, by the very force and strength of his character his sphere of operations was naturally enlarged, and when the civilized world was startled by the horrible crimes perpetuated upon the innocent and unoffending at Kischineff, Bessarabia, Russia, on the 19th of April, 1903, he then, as the executive of the greatest secular organization of Jews in America, displayed the highest qualities of the statesman in endeavoring to solve the grave and absorbing problems thus presented, made available the moral force engendered by enlightened public sentiment aroused to the condemnation of outrage and wrong, and by his consummate ability achieved international renown.

It was his crowning aspiration, after making sufficient provision for his loved ones, to consecrate his labors to the betterment of mankind.

To aid in the accomplishment of his purpose, nature had served him well. He was tall in stature, and had the carriage and build of an athlete; a massive brow gave evidence of his powerful intellect, while his steady, penetrating, but kindly eyes, finely molded features and attractive personality, easily enchained attention.

It was an unalloyed pleasure to listen to the resonant tones of his cultivated voice, which could easily reach the limit of the largest auditoriums, and which, at his will, could persuade and arouse to enthusiasm, the delighted hearers.

He left no topic unembellished; was never, in any discussion, at a loss for the proper word; and his capacity as a debater and controversialist was remarkable. He did not know how to flatter, but sought to influence by the rectitude of his motives, and the convincing power of his talents.

And he was equally facile with his pen. And thus, to take him all in all, he had no superior in his time and generation.

He was singularly gifted as an after-dinner speaker, equal to any emergency, responding to every demand without effort or preparation, and commanding applause on every occasion, but no attempt has been made to reproduce here any of his extemporaneous addresses.

It is not the purpose to extend the dimensions of this volume by incorporating herein his speeches, or essays, of mere local interest.

The celebrated "Kischineff Petition" was wholly prepared by him and is herewith appended:

"To His Imperial Majesty, the Emperor of Russia:

The cruel outrages perpetrated at Kischineff during Easter of 1903 have excited horror and reprobation throughout the world. Until your Majesty gave special and personal directions the local authorities failed to maintain order or suppress the rioting. The victims were Jews, and the assault was the result of race and religious prejudice. The rioters violated the laws of Russia.

The local officials were derelict in the performance of their duty.

The Jews were the victims of indefensible lawlessness.

These facts are made plain by the official reports of, and by the official acts following, the riot.

Under ordinary conditions the awful calamity would be deplored without undue fear of a recurrence. But such is not the case in the present instance. Your petitioners are advised that millions of Jews, Russian subjects, dwelling in Southwestern Russia, are in constant dread of fresh outbreaks.

They feel that ignorance, superstition and bigotry, as exemplified by the rioters, are ever ready to persecute them; that the local officials, unless thereunto specially admonished, cannot be relied on as strenuous protectors of their peace and security; that a public sentiment of hostility has been engendered against them and hangs over them as a continuing menace.

Even if it is conceded that these fears are to some extent exaggerated, it is unquestionable that they exist, that they are not groundless, and that they produce effects of great importance.

The westward migration of Russian Jews, which has proceeded for over twenty years, is being stimulated by these fears, and already that movement has become so great as to overshadow in magnitude the expulsion of the Jews from Spain and to rank with the exodus from Egypt.

No estimate is possible of the misery suffered by the hapless Jews who feel driven to forsake their native land, to sever the most sacred ties, and to wander forth to strange countries.

Neither is it possible to estimate the misery suffered by those who are unwilling or unable to leave the land of their birth, who must part from friends and relatives who emigrate, who remain in never ending terror.

Religious persecution is more sinful and more fatuous than war. War is sometimes necessary, honorable and just; religious persecution is never defensible.

The sinfulness and folly which give impulse to unnecessary

war received their greatest check when your Majesty's initiative resulted in an international court of peace.

With such an example before it the civilized world cherishes the hope that upon the same initiative there shall be fixed in the early days of the twentieth century the enduring principles of religious liberty; that by a gracious and convincing expression your Majesty will proclaim, not only for the government of your own subjects, but also for the guidance of all civilized men, that none shall suffer in person, property, liberty, honor or life because of his religious belief; that the humblest subject or citizen may worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, and that government, whatever its former agencies, must safeguard these rights and immunities by the exercise of all its powers.

Far removed from your Majesty's dominions, living under different conditions and owing allegiance to another Government, your petitioners yet venture, in the name of civilization, to plead for religious liberty and tolerance; to plead that he who led his own people and all others to the shrine of peace will add new lustre to his reign and fame by leading a new movement that shall commit the whole world in opposition to religious persecutions."

On July 14th, 1903, this impressive document was, by the order of President Roosevelt, cabled, without alteration, to the American Charge d' Affaires at St. Petersburg, with a letter of introduction signed by Secretary Hay. The petition had nearly thirteen thousand signatures.

Subsequently, the petition, with the signatures, was bound in a suitable volume, and on October 5, 1903, transmitted to the Secretary of State, accompanied by a communication from him, as President of the Executive Committee, from which we make the following extract:

"For all time to come, it will testify to the love of justice, humanity and liberty which moved the President to give it countenance and its signers to father it. It stands as the verdict of the whole people condemning the denial of religious liberty,

and upholding the President in asserting that condemnation. If it be without precedent, it is the more precious for becoming one. Civilization made a distinct and notable advance when a great nation of eighty millions of people, speaking not only through its official head, but also through its most representative citizens in their individual capacities, served notice on the world that those who are made to suffer martyrdom for conscience's sake, wherever they may abide, have friends and sympathizers in this country. Such an example will not be lost. The oppressor will hereafter pause before he strikes, and his victim will be saved from utter despair by the consciousness that the voice of humanity will be raised in his behalf.

"In this view, the services rendered by the President, his advisers and the people generally, are not to be measured by the benefits conferred upon the Jews alone. This is one of the oft-recurring cases in which the Jews, by their misfortunes, have led the world to a just appreciation of the truths of which they are the devoted missionaries.

"In every part of the world where Jews are to be found there is thanksgiving because the President and you and the entire American people have championed the cause of the oppressed.

"Everywhere admiration has been excited, and in this country the people are proud of the courageous humanity which has been displayed."

On October 31, 1903, the Honorable John Hay, one of the greatest statesmen of the United States, universally loved and honored throughout this great land of liberty, made the following remarkable acknowledgment:

"October 31, 1903.

"Leo N. Levi, Esquire, President of the Executive Committee of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, 723 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

"My dear Sir:—

"I have received at the hands of the Honorable Simon Wolf,

your letter of the 5th of October. He has also delivered to me the bound copy of the Kischineff Petition.

"It gives me pleasure to accept the charge of this important and significant document, and assign it a place in the archives of the Department of State.

"Although this copy of your petition did not reach the high destination for which it was intended, its words have attained a world-wide publicity, and have found a lodgment in many thousands of minds. This petition will be always memorable, not only for what it contains, but also for the number and weight of the signatures attached to it, embracing some of the most eminent names of our generation, of men renowned for intelligence, philanthropy and public spirit. In future, when the students of history come to peruse this document, they will wonder how the petitioners, moved to profound indignation by intolerable wrongs perpetrated on the innocent and helpless, should have expressed themselves in language so earnest and eloquent and yet so dignified, so moderate and decorous. It is a valuable addition to public literature, and it will be sacredly cherished among the treasures of this Department. I am,

Very respectfully yours,

(Sd.) JOHN HAY."

A brief sketch of the life of this great man, prepared by a friend of many years duration, and the Rabbi of the Congregation at Galveston of which he was a member, Dr. Henry Cohn, is herewith appended.

JOSEPH HIRSH,

January 15, 1907. Vicksburg, Miss.

In New York City, at the dawn of day, on Wednesday, January 13th, 1904, all that was mortal of Leo N. Levi passed away. His death came as a terrible shock to his friends and acquaintances; to his wife and children, brothers and sisters, it was as if the sun was obscured at noon-day.

Mr. Levi was a born leader. Rising from the ranks, he mastered every position he held, and there was no situation that confronted him but to which he was equal. His fine diplomacy in the preparation of the Kishineff Petition, which was immediately accepted as framed, and its subsequent presentation to Russia, through the services of President Roosevelt and the late John Hay, is an instance of his acumen. "You are a great diplomat, Mr. Levi," said Mr. Hay, upon the former's suggesting the cablegram to Riddle at St. Petersburg as the best means of reaching the Czar, "and would make a great ambassador." To bring order out of chaos, whether he were dealing with communal, civic, or political problems, was his strong point. In numerous instances he saved the day for his people with honor to himself and to the cause he represented. "A great man," said President Roosevelt of him. Yea, we had no greater!

Leo N. Levi was born in Victoria, Texas, September 15th, 1856, one of a family of six children of Abraham and Mina Levi. Abraham Levi (born, Alsace 1822; died, Victoria, Texas, November 30th, 1902) and settled in Victoria in 1849, engaging in mercantile pursuits. Having received the school education afforded by his native town, Leo, then a promising youth of sixteen, matriculated at the University of Virginia, where, after a brilliant college career, he was graduated in Law. He gained,

among other University distinctions, the medal for the best University Magazine article, and the debater's medal—a coveted prize then, as it is now. It was while pursuing his college course that his courage and manliness, portending so much for his future, were first put on trial. As has often happened to our co-religionists, he was taunted with being a Jew, and he resented it verbally and physically. He won the admiration of his quondam antagonists (some of whom afterwards became his life-long friends) by his attitude; and when he passed through the portals of "Old Virginia," there was not a fellow student but thought it an honor to clasp his hand.

In 1876, Leo N. Levi, fresh from his University laurels, entered the law office of Flournoy & Scott, at Galveston, Texas, within easy distance of the parental roof at Victoria. Proving a most valuable asset to that prominent firm, he was offered a partnership, which he accepted. In 1877, he married Miss Ray Bachrach, the love of his college days, at Charlottsville, Va., and at the time of his sad demise, he had six surviving children. Making Galveston his home, he became, life and soul, a part of his environment, working for the best interests of his city, county, and state. Upon the retirement of the head of the law concern, with which he was connected, the firm, under the name of Scott & Levi, and subsequently Scott, Levi & Smith, was one of the best known, and most trusted legal establishments in the State. Mr. Levi resided in Galveston for 23 years (1876-1899), taking laudable interest in all municipal affairs, and on many occasions of grave importance to the city, he was called upon to plead its cause before the Legislative bodies of the State. Such tasks he cheerfully undertook, often at great inconvenience to himself, and at the sacrifice of his own business interests. And Galveston, the city of his adoption, recognizing his talent and worth, was not slow to do him honor. When the late President of the United States, Benjamin Harrison, visited the port for a formal celebration, the city asked Leo N. Levi and two other gentlemen to travel some distance to meet him, and also to be his constant companion during his stay. A clear thinker, a most eloquent and fearless speaker, a remarkable logician, he served

his clients, individuals and corporations, with unswerving fidelity; and he was known far and wide as a true lawyer and a sound jurist. He was a faithful exponent of honorable citizenship. He never aspired to political preferment, although his exceptional abilities were always enlisted in the cause of good government.

His public life did not lessen his allegiance to his co-religionists, to whom he was ever an able guide, and with whom he was an enthusiastic worker. In 1887, he was elected President of Congregation B'nai Israel at Galveston, and retained the office until his departure for New York. During those twelve years and prior to that, he affiliated with every local charitable, educational and social institution, occupying in all of them, at one time or another, positions of honor and responsibility. Intellectual culture among his brethren was very dear to him, and only second to the desire he had for the amelioration of the condition of the oppressed Israelites all over the world. It was in Galveston that he became a member of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, a Jewish fraternal Organization, whose sphere extends to the four quarters of the globe. In due course he was elected president of District No. 7 of that Order, comprising seven southern states, and more than once he received engrossed testimonials setting forth his usefulness to his district Grand Lodge. In 1900, at the Constitution Grand Lodge in Chicago, Leo N. Levi was chosen President of the whole Order succeeding Mr. Julius Bien, who had then retired from the presidency to fill the position of Foreign Chancellor. As the head of the I. O. B. B., Mr. Levi was particularly influential in the appeal of the United States government to Roumania, in connection with the abominable Jewish policy of that kingdom and subsequently presented to President Roosevelt the protest addressed to the Russian Government, consequent upon the horrible massacre at Kishineff. In the conferences pending these negotiations Mr. Levi had several personal interviews with the President of the United States. The cable to the U. S. ambassador at St. Petersburg, a collaboration of John Hay and Leo N. Levi, embodying the Kishineff Petition, which Mr. Levi wrote himself,

will go down to history, and if the latter had accomplished nothing else in his life than the work incident upon this unique circumstance, notwithstanding the Czar's refusal to receive the matchless document, he would have served his life's purpose. But apart from this occurrence, his services to the I. O. B. B. and through this organization to the Jews of this country were inestimable. As has been said above, Leo N. Levi was a noted speaker, having lectured in many states of the Union and on varied subjects. In 1899 he delivered the Commencement Lecture at the State University at Austin, "The Successful Life," which was acclaimed to be the best address ever heard within the walls of that institution, and which the faculty use today in the classical department, as a specimen of inspiring thought and lofty diction.

A devoted husband and father, an energetic worker in humanity's cause, an ideal and an inspiration to thousands of his fellow citizens, he was stricken down in the midst of a career whose usefulness gave promise of increase with years. But we know nothing; and subject to an inscrutable Providence, we can only bow our head in resignation, and pay this poor tribute to one whose like we shall not see again.

Ascend Thou to heaven thou worthy son of Abraham! Thou art mourned by hundreds of thousands! Thy life has been well spent! Abide with Thy Maker to all eternity!

HENRY COHEN.

Galveston, Texas, May 15th, 1906.

ADDRESS OF ACCEPTANCE.

Bro. Leo N. Levi, in accepting the position, spoke as follows:

Brethren of the Convention: I thank you for this great honor—for honor indeed it is. The feelings which arise in my breast engender a fear that I have taken upon myself a burden under which I shall stagger, if not fall. I told you last night I had little respect for mere words, and I shall vindicate that declaration by saying but little here now, and what I do say will be in the line of the performance of my duty. You are about to follow the election of your President by the election of other officers who are to co-operate with him and work with him in attaining the mission of our Order. I say to you and I say to them that I shall receive any expressions of discontent, any criticism of any remissness that is personal to myself with tenderness, with gentleness and with a forgiving spirit. But I say to you upon this solemn and, I believe, historic occasion, that the man who is associated with me or subordinated to me who fails or falters in his duty to the Order will find me as unrelenting and as severe as if I commanded an army in the face of a dangerous foe. I said to one who will probably be on the Executive Committee, and I repeat it now, that if at any time during my administration a single member of that Committee by reason of his business engagements, sickness or other cause fails to perform the duties of his office, I shall expect his resignation, and if it is not forthcoming, I shall ask it, and I make that announcement to you now because I don't want to then be accused of autocracy or of despotism. I make the declaration now because I want your sanction to that declaration of policy, and if you dissent from it, I want a declaration of dissent. I make the declaration now because I want you to bear it in mind when you select the members of your Executive Committee, and I want the

candidates for those positions to keep it in their minds when they accept the responsibility. If I stand on the bridge of your vessel in the storm and in the calm to guide her on her course, I want to know that my mates, my engineers and my crew are equally vigilant and equally diligent in the performance of the duties that are assigned to them, and I shall exact it.

It has been said that we are entering upon a new era in the destiny of the Jew. I believe that, I believe it firmly. I stated years ago that I believed that the salvation of Judaism was the American-born Jew. I have traveled over this land and I find our young men and our young women, unversed as they are in the old traditional forms and ceremonies, strangers to the ritual around which cling so many tender memories in the minds of our older people, yet animated, inspired and uplifted by the quickening love which they bear to the old ancestral faith, and craving for media of expression for that feeling. They seek it in good works, in charitable deeds, in the amelioration of the condition of our fellowmen; and I believe that when we bring to them the mission which has sustained us so long, when we make apparent to them that here is the field for their activity, that we will gain from them that co-operation, in the need of which we so sorely stand. But we must carry our wares to them, we must inspire them with the courage that has sustained us, and with the infusion of new spirit and new energy and new aspiration create a new epoch, not for ourselves but for the people for whom this Order stands. And it does stand for the people—the greatest organiztion among the Jews known in the history of the world, spread over all the world, conducted by its representative men, it stands for the Jew and for Judaism. And, filled with that conviction can you wonder that, strong man as I am and well balanced as I am, for that quality has been attributed to me, that I assume the position of your leader with a faltering heart, with a faltering tongue. I know the responsibility. I know the weight that I have taken upon myself, and I know how much it behooves me and you to invoke the aid of Almighty God and the loving and loyal co-operation of every man who has enlisted under the banner of the B'nai B'rith—not because it will do him good, not

because it will glorify him, but because it will do good to those that need good; because the voice of music in him sings in good deeds—good deeds always and ever and at whatever sacrifice.

I will accept your leadership on this platform and with that pledge from you, and I will carry on the work as long as I have the power to do so and the capacity to do so and the opportunity to do so; and as long as you stand by me in that work I pledge you this—I pledge you this—that I shall watch myself even more closely than I do you, and if ever there comes the time when by reason of my business engagements, of physical infirmity, or whatever it may be, I cannot devote to this work what it deserves, I shall demand the resignation of your President.

I remember one of the most impressive incidents in the history of Germany, when Field Marshal Von Moltke went to the Emperor and said: "Sire, I tender my resignation. I can no longer mount my horse." It was the magnificent spectacle of the soldier and the patriot who set duty up above all other things. And whenever any consideration makes it impossible for me to put my foot in the stirrup and leap into the saddle, I shall follow his example. We have had a noble exhibition of that spirit here today; and it is with the greatest pleasure that I advert to the great services and the long services which we have enjoyed at the hands of him who now retires from the chief executiveship of this Order, with all the glory and magnificence of the setting sun. (Great applause.) As I witnessed the scene here this morning and thought of myself as the successor of that man who has laid down the sceptre of power, I was reminded of the tree which grows where I spent most of the years of my life, on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico—the salt cedar—that grows best in storm and stress of weather, and at last, when, succumbing to the inroads of time and the assaults of the elements it bends to the earth to give up its life, there shoots from its side as it reclines on the ground, new roots from which springs a fresh and vigorous growth. And so, sir (addressing Bro. Bien), I say to you that your work is not ended with your retirement, for from those works, from those achievements there will spring a growth of

vigorous trees that will arise from the roots that you have planted. (Great applause.)

Now, my friends, I thank you for all that is personal in this election—and for nothing else. I do not consider the honor, I consider the burden. If I live long enough to meet you five years from now, and if I can say to you in the official reports and warranted by the official facts, that I have achieved something, I want that to be my eulogy and nothing else.

I thank you. (Great applause.)

THE MODERN DISPERSION.

Address delivered at Wilson Street Temple, Cleveland, Ohio, May 17, 1903, by Leo N. Levi, during the convention of District Grand Lodge No. 2, I. O. B. B.

The full importance of contemporary events is rarely appreciated. History remains to most men a sealed book unless it deals with the remote past. The rulers and teachers, the sages and prophets, are those who are able to measure present occurrences in the light of the past, and foresee the future in the light of both.

Every Jewish child knows and understands the story of the Exodus; of the Babylonian captivity; of the Asmonean wars; of the destruction of Jerusalem; of the Diaspora; of the expulsion from Spain. Each of these epochs furnishes materials for a sublime epic, and the materials have been freely employed by poets and minstrels.

The heroism of achievement and endurance, so prominent in Jewish history, appeals to all men strongly, to the Jews irresistibly. At some time in the life of every manly boy he has deplored that he did not live in the age of chivalry; that he was denied the triumphs and glories of knight-errantry. The manly Jew at all times envies those who were enabled against Egyptian, Babylonian, Syrian, Roman or Spaniard, to exhibit in action or martyrdom the indestructible spirit of his race. There is a peculiar charm about past occurrences. They come, filtered, to us through the souls of historians, poets, artists and musicians. Their odious features have been eliminated, and what is left offers no offense to the æsthetic or artistic sense.

The history of the present lacks these advantages. It has not been set in artistic order. It has not been freed from its obnoxious elements. It has not been refined. It is unsettled, crude, nauseous; full of grime, dirt, blood, sweat and offal. When we

see the soldier in his camp, living in filth, infested by vermin, violating the laws of health, ignoring in speech and conduct the precepts of morality, made coarse and growing coarser by his environment, we are prone to call him a degenerate. We contrast him with the heroic men who fought for our liberties in the romantic ages of the past. But the heroes of the past, however they appear in song and story, were in their day like unto the unattractive man we now decry, and the latter in times to come will be scoured and take his place along with the others in the chronicles of the heroic dead.

It is not only a canon of taste, but also a law of justice, which makes the historian deal mainly with the virtues and lightly with the shortcomings of mankind. To err is human. Sinfulness, if not inherent and original, is so common that it is not distinguishing. It is always in evidence, and moves along an easy downward path. Virtue, on the other hand, while abiding in every soul, is repressed by selfishness and must ever struggle upward along thorny ways. When it is in evidence, it is, therefore, a distinction. In the final judgment of men, what good they have done and what evil they have resisted must be the controlling considerations. The rewards of virtue cannot with justice be withheld, because with virtue is commingled the infirmities common to mankind. The Pentateuch has doubtless left unchronicled many sins that might with truth be imputed to its great characters, and even as it is, of none of its notables can it be said he was faultless. Yet we revere and love them, not for their faults, but in spite of them; and because, in their lives, if virtue was not always the exclusive possessor, it was the dominator.

In dealing with our contemporaries we are not so just. We are apt to magnify the faults of others by comparison with our own virtues, and to belittle their virtues by comparison with our own imperfections. Instead of employing a standard by which to measure them and ourselves alike, we make standards of ourselves, and condemn all who fall short of or go beyond it. This infirmity is largely responsible for the failure to appreciate the great historical crisis through which the Jews are now passing, and the duties arising therefrom.

During the past twenty-three years the world, without understanding it, has witnessed a radical change in the situation of the Jews. It is still in progress, and will doubtless continue to be for many decades. In some respects it is similar to the Exodus, but, more properly speaking, it is the Modern Dispersion.

During many generations the majority of the Jews have dwelt in Russia, Galicia, Roumania and Hungary. In Russia and Galicia alone their number reached almost to five millions. It is needless to dwell on their condition. The story is well known. Suffice it to say that a little over twenty years ago the Jews began to leave these countries in large numbers, and that since then there has been an uninterrupted flow of immigration to the Orient, to Western Europe, to South America, and last, but not least, to the United States.

During the period under consideration ten per centum of the Jews of the world forsook their native homes in Eastern Europe and took up new abodes in this country. At the present time this influx to the United States equals or exceeds annually one-half of one per cent of the world's total Jewish population. Add to this number those who settle in Western Europe, the Levant, the West Indies, Central and South America, South Africa and Canada, and we can readily foretell that within the first half of the twentieth century the Jewish center of gravity will be far removed from Eastern Europe. Indeed, since the stream to the United States grows larger with the passing years, we may count with some confidence that in this century the majority of the world's Jews will have established there domicile here, or certainly on the Western Hemisphere. The migration from Eastern Europe in our day is strikingly like the migration from Spain at the end of the fifteenth century, except that in the expulsion from Spain not over three per cent of the world's Jews were, while now considerably more than one-half are, involved.

In short, the present dispersion has all of the tragic and romantic features of the Spanish expulsion, is impelled by an equal intolerance, endured with equal martyrdom, but exceeds it in interest and importance, because Spain only had, at most, three

hundred thousand Jews, while Eastern Europe is driving forth five millions.

The effect of the expulsion from Spain need not be more than mentioned. It is a well known historical fact. What is important now to study is the effect of the immigration now in progress. It must not be belittled because the immigrants are poor, ignorant, superstitious, narrow, untidy, or otherwise unattractive. The Jews who fled from Egypt were infinitely below the standard of these. Those who were driven from Jerusalem by the Romans were not superior to the Jews who are now on the march. Even the Spanish refugee, around whom glows the halo of romance, had the shortcomings of mankind in full measure. Nor can we make unfavorable comparisons by weighing the causes of the various migrations now under consideration. It may be conceded that the Tsar is not a monster, and that the Russians are not consciously unjust to the Jews. The same be conceded to the King of Roumania and his subjects. It may be further conceded that the Jews in Russia and Roumania are undesirable, and even obnoxious from a view-point which we do not occupy, and which, if erroneous, is nevertheless believed to be correct.

Must we not concede as much to Pharaoh, to Rome, to Spain? Even as we know the past, such concessions are demanded, and let us not forget that we know the past only from view-points variant from or opposite to those of the Egyptians, the Romans and the Spaniards! They had their sides in the argument, just as Russia and Roumania now have theirs. History has condemned the views of Egypt, Rome and Spain. It will doubtless condemn Russia and Roumania. Its judgment has not been based in the former, nor will it be in the present cases, upon the unimpeachable virtues of the Jews among men, but simply and solely upon the fact that they were and are members of the human family. It was and is unjust to oppress them, not because they were or are better than their oppressors, but because, whatever their failings, they are human beings, and as such entitled to humane treatment. Any other view is poetical, sentimental and romantic, but it is misleading and unjust.

The verdict of the historian, however, need not trouble us now. Our task is to see now what the historian will easily make out when time gives a perspective and the atmosphere is clear of the dust and smoke of the conflict. What is our verdict? And how will it affect our conduct? Such questions may not be regarded as academic by any one, certainly not by any Jew. To him, wherever he dwells and whatever his condition, these questions are pressingly practical. What is his view of the modern Dispersion? And how will that view impel him to act? How will the American Jew, and especially the well-to-do and cultivated American Jew, respond?

The problem is not a little complicated by prejudices of various kinds. The Jews are favorites only of God. Their fellowmen, for one reason or another, or no reason at all, refuse to endorse the decree of Heaven, which has singled Israel out as a peculiar and chosen band. Even though the rejected stone has again and again been divinely honored as the chief corner-stone, it has been denied recognition by man. This lack of atonement between man and God is, however, not unique. There are other differences as well.

The Jews do not regard anti-Semitism with contentment or patience. On the contrary, they resent it as a gross injustice. But they have grown accustomed to it and meet it as an inevitable evil. United against the hostility of the world, the Jews draw comfort from one another and the splendid heritage left by their ancestors. There exist, however, prejudices among the Jews themselves, which to the Gentile at least must appear marvelous.

These prejudices are based on many classifications not now necessary to be considered. The one classification of greatest importance is that which sets on one side the Jews of Western Europe and the United States, variously called the Reformed, the Modern, and the German and American Jews, and on the other the Jews of Russia, Galicia, Roumania and other East European countries, variously called Russian, Polish or Orthodox Jews. For convenience, let us call the former Western and the latter Eastern Jews.

As a rule the Western Jews have absorbed Western civiliza-

tion, and bear lightly or not at all the yoke of the Torah. As a rule, to the Eastern Jews Western civilization is yet unknown, and they adhere to the same religious views and practices which prevailed centuries ago. The Western Jew has a modern education, and speaks with facility the language of his native land; the Eastern Jew's education is largely religious, and his mother tongue is the jargon known as Yiddish. The points of difference between the Eastern and Western Jews are numerous and important, but not so much so as each believes. The prejudices of each against the other magnify the differences and the faults which each ascribes to the other on account thereof.

The Western Jew treats his co-religionist from Eastern Europe as an inferior. He considers him ignorant, superstitious, bigoted, hypocritical, cunning, ungrateful, quarrelsome, unclean, and in many other ways abominable.

The view of the Western Jew is superficial, hasty and wholly unjust. It is based largely upon hearsay, and otherwise upon loose generalizations made from very limited observations. The Eastern Jews are looked upon *en masse,* and not as individuals. Each is considered as possessing all the faults charged to the class, and all are misjudged by the failings that are noticed in a few individuals. Those who like the Eastern Jews least, know them least; their best friends are those who know them well.

It is not proposed to claim extraordinary virtues for the Eastern Jews. They are human, and have the vices as well as the good qualities of the human family. Among them are exemplars of the highest and lowest elements of the human make-up. A close study of them begets always a forecast of a noble future. Of their status at present it would be well for those who know them only by hearsay to remember the quaint old admonition: "Let the greater part of what thou hearest be the least part of what thou believest, lest the greater part of what thou believest be the least part of what is true."

In the eyes of the Eastern Jew the Western Jew is a cad. His education is superficial and flashy; his philanthropy ostentatious and insincere; his manners a cheap imitation of the Gentiles, upon whom he fawns; his religion a miserable compromise, in

which appearances count for everything; his assumption of superiority another proof that "every ass thinks himself fit to stand among the king's horses."

The Western Jew as a rule, because of his prejudices, remains indifferent or hostile to the great migration to which I have adverted. The Eastern Jew, on the other hand, defiantly stands on his inherent rights, and jeeringly foretells the decadence of his traducers, just as the Sephardim passed out before the inrush of the ancestors of the present Jewish aristocracy.

The Eastern Jew is superficial, hasty and unjust in his views. He is guilty of the same errors that he complains of in the Western Jew. He takes counsel of his passions, and refuses to see the good qualities of those who are serving while they anger him.

Thoughtful men among both classes deplore these differences and seek to remove them. However great the differences, they are small by comparison with the similarities. No Jew can escape his inheritance, even if he would. All Jews are brethren, whether or not they like the fact or one another. Cain was Abel's brother, though he slew him.

This fraternity, moreover, is always in evidence. If the poor Eastern Jew is murdered in Bessarabia, the daintiest Western Jew makes an outcry of horror. If an aristocratic Western Jew is made a martyr on Devil's Island, the most intense Eastern Jew groans in sympathy.

In some way the blood relationship always asserts itself. The Jews may hate, despise, contemn and abuse one another, but let an outsider take up the same cue and the brotherhood engenders harmony. Perhaps this is rather humane than Jewish. At all events, the Jews throughout their history have been famous for their family quarrels, which were composed when outsiders attacked the family. The present differences will be composed, as have all others in the past, but is it necessary to wait for time or a common peril to establish the mutual consideration, respect and affection that should of right obtain? Shall we not profit by experience and study? Shall foolish passions aggravate evils which wise thought can remove?

The circumference and diameter of the universe are unknown quantities, but each man has its center fixed in himself. The egoism to which this is due is neither altogether bad or good. It is a mixed composite of evil and virtue. To the extent that it dignifies the individual and makes him a conservator of his own welfare, it is a blessing. On the other hand because of it the individual is apt to make too much of himself and too little of others. When a man establishes and maintains in his thought and conduct the proper relation between himself and the rest of the world, he is always good and often great. Few attain this, but it is true that many seek it. To these it is helpful to consider and discuss at frequent intervals the privileges and duties of life, so that not only may general principles be preserved, but the correct application thereof made to the details of life.

The Eastern Jew, which term includes both foreigners and their immediate descendants, must learn that he is not a law unto himself; that he is a part of a larger community; that his situation affects others besides himself; that these others have a right to study and aid in solving his problems; that it is illogical and ungrateful to accept material aid while resenting friendly interest and counsel; that Western Jews are not apostates because they are not observers of the Schulcan Aruch; that the prejudices which he resents are nourished by the prejudices which he himself indulges in. The inevitable and irresistible tendency of his children is toward Occidentalism, and unless he cultivates harmony and sympathy with the Western Jew, he must stand on the brink of an ever-widening chasm between himself and his own offspring. It is well enough to hate what is evil in his Western brothers, but he must not hate them. Hate begets hate, just as love begets love. In the war of angry passion the Eastern Jew may indeed triumph through the force of overwhelming numbers, but such a victory would be more disastrous than a defeat. There should be no triumph of what is peculiar to either class, for the peculiarities are seldom good; the victory should be for the humanity which is common to both.

It goes without saying that a respectable proportion of Western Jews are deeply moved by the Modern Dispersion, and testify

by innumerable sacrifices that they understand and are performing the duties which it imposes on them. Unfortunately, however, there yet remain many who, either because of ignorance or injustice, look with cold indifference or hot hostility upon the arrival of their suffering co-religionists. This is true even in the United States, where it might be expected that American birth, American training and American ideals would engender extraordinary tenderness towards brethren who suffer martyrdom for conscience's sake.

Every American Jew should read or re-read of the expulsion from Spain as told in the history of Ferdinand and Isabella by the American historian Prescott. There he will find almost the same conditions which now prevail. Under Ferdinand and Isabella the Jews were denounced for the same faults and crimes now laid at their doors in Eastern Europe. They were charged with being parasites, usurers, non-producers; with being ostentatious, gaudy and vulgar, and above all, with murdering Christians to obtain their blood for the Passover bread. When they were forced to leave Spain on the fateful ninth of Ab, in 1492, they were impoverished, and they carried to other lands, and especially to Italy, not only their poverty, but the plague, which was produced by their pitiable sufferings. Wherever they went, for a time at least they proved a burden, if not a positive injury, to the native Jews.

This expulsion was not only defended by the Spaniards of the fifteenth century, but also by the writers of other Christian countries. Indeed, during the succeeding centuries, the terrible tragedy which involved so many lives and entailed so much misery has been cited as evidence of Spanish piety and the just punishment which is visited upon the miserable Jew.

Three hundred thousand persons, according to Graetz—fewer than two hundred thousand according to Prescott—were driven out of Spain. More than four centuries have passed since that awful occurrence, and yet the horror of it grows instead of passing away. Who would dare in this country at least to say a word in defense of Spain's intolerance, or utter aught but sympathy for her victims? And yet the Jews being driven from

Roumania are as many as were in Spain; those who have fled from Russia and Galicia to the United States in twenty years more than double the number of the Spanish Jews.

Who can find fault with the Spanish Jews who brought the plague to Genoa, whither they fled? In many European cities in which the refugees sought an asylum were Jews whose position was assured until the refugees placed it in jeopardy. Were these few established Jews of more account than the refugees? Were they entitled to immunity from the real or fancied dangers due to the dispersion of the Spanish Jews? What were their rights and duties? The same question demands an answer now at the hands of the American Jew.

It is contended by some that the American Jews had won a proud station in this country before the dispersion began; that politically, socially and economically they were prosperous, and highly respected; that the Eastern Jews have endangered the prestige previously enjoyed; that they have driven the American Jews out of certain lines of business and threaten to monopolize many others; that they congest our seaboard cities, and, finally, that they in many ways bring odium to the Jewish name.

If all this were true, what then? Does it justify the persecutions here which are denounced when practiced in Eastern Europe? Does it justify hostility to a people who seek an asylum in the land which is great because it has been from the beginning the refuge of the oppressed? Whatever may be said, truly or falsely, about the Eastern Jews, we must find our proper relation to the problem they present. The American people as a whole has taken its stand on the broad platform of sympathy and humanity. The American Jew who in this crisis is less humane and sympathetic than the whole American people is neither a good American nor a good Jew.

If it were necessary to choose between the welfare of the one million Jews in this country and the millions who must ultimately come here, justice would turn to the greater number. The millions are on the march. The dispersion is on in full force. No power on earth can stop it. Potentates and legions

are powerless to stem the tide. The few Jews who selfishly deplore the immigration to this country may as well resign themselves to the inevitable first as last. The current of the Mississippi cannot be reversed by imprecations or the onrush of Niagara stopped by making faces at it.

It is, however, a grievous error to spell danger or misfortune to the Western Jews from the dispersion of the Eastern Jews. If the former have in the course of generations thrown off many useless impediments, they have suffered along with them the loss of many family jewels. The idealism, the poetry, the ascetic virtues, the family sanctity, the religious fervor, which were formerly so accentuated in Jewish life, have been in a measure lost in the process which eliminated certain Orientalisms that are found and decried in the contemporary Eastern Jews. The American Jews will profit by contact with the repositories of ancient Jewish virtues. For this advantage they can make an adequate return by aiding the newcomer to throw aside the faults which the Western Jew has gotten rid of. The two classes must be complementary. Each has its faults and its virtues. If folly prevails the virtues of neither will survive; if wisdom governs, the contact of the classes will minimize the worst qualities of each and start from the Modern Dispersion a chapter in Jewish history as glorious as any that precedes it. And this wisdom is to the fore. Broad men in both classes are assuming the leadership. The gospel of discord and hate is giving way to the gospel of harmony and love. The monger of sneers and denunciations has had his day. The forces of destruction are spent and those of construction are growing. The contemned beggar of twenty years ago is the man of affairs to-day; the beggar of to-day will be a man of substance in the near future. The arrogant and shallow minded inheritor of his father's wealth without his father's thrift will pass out with the wealth he has not the wit to preserve. There will be a commingling of the classes to make a stronger and better class. It is manifest destiny.

The duty to promote the betterment of both so that the inevitable end may be better, surer and sooner is obvious. History

is being made at a tremendous pace, and it is being written while it is being made. In a few years we shall see on this continent a re-born, rehabilitated, virile, powerful Jewry, enriching the world with its virtues, its energies and its genius. Those who contribute to the chronicle which is being made up will in their own lives and in those of their children gather fruits from the seeds they have planted. Those who remain deaf to the call of duty, who do not rise to the standard of their country and their race, must inevitably forfeit the respect of their fellowmen at large as well as the social, political and economic rewards which now quicken in the womb of the future for the Jews.

The Modern Dispersion means on this hemisphere the regenerated Jews in whom shall be united what is best among the dispersed, and from whose numbers will be eliminated the weaklings, the degenerates and the unfaithful.

ADDRESS DELIVERED AT THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH CHARITIES, HELD AT DETROIT, MICH., MARCH, 1902.

Mr. President, in a circular which I had sent forth a year ago in my official capacity as the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, and in which circular I dealt with what is known as the removal work of Roumanian immigrants and the dwellers in the Ghetto of New York, I employed a sentence which I beg to read now as the text of what I am about to say: "The Jew must be taught that no era in Jewish history exceeds the present in importance and solemnity, and that to play a proper role therein is a high privilege and a higher duty; that it is the concern of each Jew to rescue his brethren from poverty, disease and death, and, above all, to give to their boys the chance to become honest men, and their girls the sacred right to remain pure."

I realize that I am addressing an audience composed not of the rank and file, but of the leaders of communal Jewish activity in the United States, and that my auditors are familiar with the larger outlines of every Jewish question which challenges the attention of Jewish minds, and therefore I shall not go into the details in presenting thoughts that I wish to convey to you, and the first idea is to impress upon you the fact that this is a great historical era in Jewish affairs. We all know, from the teachings of our childhood, how great an event was the Exodus of the Jews from Egypt. We know that a civilization worthy of the name is broadly based upon that great event so full of glory and of gloom. Now if you will reflect for a moment upon the many thousands of Jews who left Egypt for the Holy Land, and if you will reflect that in the nature of things these Jews, while living in Egypt were not confined within any one locality, you must realize that the preparation at least for the emigration, if

not the emigration itself, was not instantaneous. It must have proceeded over a considerable portion of time, and a very distinct parallel can be drawn between that exodus and subsequent migrations of the Jews under the stress of persecution.

If we come to the great event in the history of the Jews and observe their expulsion from Spain at the end of the fifteenth century, we must again realize, if we think of the subject, that that expulsion proceeded over a considerable duration of time. I know that until my mind was specially directed to it, I had a vague and nebulous idea that the edict went forth that the Jews should leave Spain, and that between sunrise and sunset Spain was rid of her Jews; but when I come to think that, with all the facilities we have for moving the people across the Atlantic in this advanced era, it is a great achievement to move 100,000 people from America to Europe during the summer, and when I reflect how imperfect were the facilities for transportation at the end of the fifteenth century, I must know, even without consulting passages of history, that the many thousands of Jews in Spain, many of whom were compelled to seek foreign parts, could not have abandoned their native country except after the lapse of considerable time.

Now I mention this fact because I wish to impress upon you how strong is the parallel between the exodus in ancient history and the expulsion of the Jews in the middle ages, or at the end of the middle ages, and the great movement which began something over twenty years ago from Southeastern Europe towards the Western Hemisphere.

The movement has been continuous. It has been more acute at some periods than at others, but it has been a steady stream of Jews moving from Southeastern Europe to the western hemisphere, and mainly to the United States of America, and no one can tell you when that stream will be stopped unless the source is exhausted. Now it is no light thing in the history of so important a people as the Jews, to contemplate the complete transference of the balance of population from one hemisphere to another. And when you reflect that the influx of Jews during the past 21 or 22 years to this country has been at the rate of 50,000

per annum, and that the total Jewish population of the world is variously estimated at from eight to eleven million, it is easy to understand that there may be people within the sound of my voice at this moment who will live to see the majority of the Jews of the world at home in the United States of America. So I think that when these plain facts are before you, it is easy to assent to my initial proposition that we are in the midst of a great Jewish historical era.

Now we have our emotions aroused, we have our indignation aroused, we are driven to horror when we read or hear of the persecutions of the Jews in Egypt and their exodus from that land, and of the terrible edict which went forth under the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella, which drove the Jews to flee to poverty, and alas! in many instances, to suicide as an alternative to dishonor. But we remain indifferent to the great historical movement that is going on in our own day—that stream which passes by our own door, the suffering which appeals to us by immediate contact with us. I have tried to understand why it is that so many people can have sentiments of pity and horror aroused by the far-off suffering Jews in Egypt and Spain, and yet turn with loathing and disgust from the suffering that now confronts us. And my analysis is this:

Poverty and suffering are always loathsome, and history and art and literature abhor, eschew and avoid features of that kind. So that when the historian or writer sets down for the contemplation of the artist, those things which occurred in Egypt or in Spain, he addresses himself to the work of the romantic and the beautiful and attractive side of the picture, even making suffering attractive; but when we are confronted with horror and with disease, with the terrors of persecution, when we are compelled to look at it with our eyes, and not through the eyes of the artist and poet, the seams, the faults, the patches and sores obtrude themselves upon us, and what is on the surface claims more attention than what is beneath.

Now I ought not to be required to do more than to touch upon this point to these leaders of charity work, and I touch upon it because I hope you will teach those who come within

the sphere of your influence the importance of this truth, that in dealing with charity and philanthropic problems, we must learn to look with an unflinching eye on those features, which are repulsive, because in the absence of the repulsive feature there is no adequate challenge for philanthropic work. Now, I have heard much in the course of my experience about measures of one kind or another to stop this influx of people from Europe to the United States. Now and then some one introduces a bill in Congress or writes an article in the magazine or newspaper, and suggests a remedy for what seems to be an evil, and whenever that problem has come to me for consideration, I have solved it, at least to my own satisfaction, if not to any one's else, by this fact gleaned from the teachings of history, that wherever a people as such has been impelled by social economy or religious consideration to move from the home of their nativity, *en masse,* to some other part of the globe, there is no power under the sun that can stop them. There are no laws that can be put on the statute book, nor armies that can be marshalled on the frontiers, that will stop a people, who are driven by a force from the rear greater than any resisting force that can be put in front; and when a people are threatened with starvation at home, when they are deprived of the means of making a livelihood, when they are denied the right to rear their children with the rudiments of even a common school education, when they are forbidden by restrictive legislation and a hostile environment from making honorable men of their sons and pure women of their daughters, you can put no barriers in their pathway that will stop them from going elsewhere. That, I believe, is one of God's dispensations, and it goes beyond the power of man to set it aside. (Applause.) So that I think we may just as well settle down to the conviction that as long as the countries in Southeastern Europe, or anywhere else, persecute the Jews because they are Jews, deny them the right to make a living because they are Jews, those Jews are going to move out of the country in which they were born, because they are commanded to do so by circumstances. And as President Harrison said in his second message (certainly one of his messages) to the country: "When-

ever a country, by its treatment of a people, or by its laws, commands them to step out of that country, they give them a command to step into some other country." The command seems to have been interpreted in Roumania and in Galicia when they are ordered out of their country that they should step into the United States. They have been coming here for 20 odd years. Their coming has been looked upon with fear and trembling, but they have come nevertheless. Those who predicted untold disasters 20 years ago because of the influx of the Russian Jews have been refuted by the developments of the last two decades, because the refugees of 20 years ago are the artisans and manufacturers and the merchants and the bone and sinew of the Jewish part of this country today. (Applause.)

And let me tell you another thing, my friends, even you who are disposed to turn up your noses at the Russian Jew and the Galician Jew and the Roumanian Jew, that just as certainly as the children of the Portuguese Jews in the middle of the 19th century were destined to meet with the descendants of the German Jews who came over in the middle of the century, just so certain it is that the sons of these derided Russian and Roumanian and Galician Jews will meet with your daughters, and your sons will meet with their daughters.

Now they are coming. Where do they come? They come to New York. The great steamship lines that are engaged in transportation are nearly all centered at New York as a port of entry. The statistics show that of a million who came to this country in 20 years, probably 90 per cent came into the port of New York. The statistics also show that over 60 per cent of those who arrive remain in New York, certainly in the first instance. Now what becomes of them in New York? It was said here this morning by a very interesting representative from Kansas City that these people who go out from New York think so much of us in New York that they want to get back. Now that strikes me as humorous, but it is tragic. It is worthy of your consideration. If you had an opportunity to see the conditions in New York, you would understand why it is that they want to get back. The so-called Ghetto of New

York, bounded on the north by Houston Street, on the west by the Bowery, and running southward and eastward to the river, contains as many Jews as Detroit contains people. The whole city of Detroit, if crowded into that little section, would displace a similar number of Jews who have come to this country from Southeastern Europe in the last 20 years, and their descendants. And that is a very small territory. There are thousands, yea, tens of thousands of citizens in the city of New York, a good many of them Jews, who have never set foot in that territory. Just think of dumping the whole city of Detroit down into the city of New York, and a large proportion of the city of New York, not knowing it was there,—but that is the fact. It is a region almost unknown to a very large portion of the population of New York, and, of course, it goes without saying, unknown to those who do not live in that vicinity. In that region the language that is spoken is the traditional Yiddish of the Jews. In the stores, the articles they were accustomed to purchase in the land of their nativity are offered for sale. The signs are written in their own language in the Hebrew character. The cafes and places of amusement, the theater hall, the dance hall, everything is there which they were accustomed to, and whatever their tastes, whether good or evil, demand, is purveyed for their gratification. They think in their own language; they can worship there according to the rituals they are accustomed to; their atmosphere is one which they are acquainted with, and all other atmospheres are foreign to them. Now if you take any one of this audience and suddenly transport him to a foreign land, if there be a group of Americans in any one portion of that foreign country, it would be perfectly natural for you and me to gravitate to that little colony. And we would not like to get out into the interior of the country where we did not know the language of the country, the geography of the country, the habits of the people; where no one could understand us, and we could understand no one. A feeling of homesickness would overcome us, our hearts would become terrified, and if that would be true of us who are presumed to have at least some understanding of the configuration of this globe and of the difference

in nationalities and habits and customs of peoples, how much more so must that be true of a class of people whose whole world had no larger horizon than the little town in which they were born and raised in some obscure part of Southeastern Europe? For them to come to America means for them to come to New York. They have an idea that what lies beyond the limits of New York is a wilderness; that once they get away from the Ghetto they lose the friends they were accustomed to; that if sickness, trouble or death comes they have no one to turn to. If they are religiously inclined—and the Russian Jews are—they have no place in which they can worship in harmony outside of the Ghetto. And so they cling there tenaciously, even to the brink of starvation rather than to go out into a wilderness or to give up that which is so precious to them. But the limit has been reached. It was reached long ago. You have heard papers here on the subject of tuberculosis, mentioned by the President in his message also. You will hear others dealing with conditions in the New York Ghetto. Some of the speakers and some of those who have written papers have toyed with the fringes of the garment so to speak. Perhaps none of them are qualified to deal adequately with the subject. If there be any one here who is so qualified, and who should discharge the duty of acquainting the public with it, you would have no time to listen to anything else. But let me tell you, and I will call witnesses to prove the proposition, that no man, however intelligent or industrious in his reading and his research, can form the remotest idea of the conditions prevailing in the lower portion of New York, unless he goes there and makes personal inspection. Now I can not deal with these conditions today because time does not permit, but I can give you a few side lights. I want to tell you just one little instance. At 11 o'clock at night I, together with some companions, sat in a famous cafe on Canal Street, and while we were drinking the Russian tea, I heard a flutter at my elbow, and turned around, and there discovered a little girl about 13 years of age with a head of hair that would be worth a fortune to a painter, with eyes that were tinged with melancholy and a face of perfect and pitiful beauty, and she

had under her arm a bundle of Yiddish newspapers, which she was peddling out at a penny apiece at 11 o'clock at night. When she was interrogated, she informed us that her name was L——; she went to school until 3 o'clock in the afternoon, and then immediately, after getting a crust of bread and a glass of tea, went out to sell papers. When asked how long she remained out, she said until all her papers were sold. And at 11 o'clock at night she had 25 yet undisposed of. We bought her papers and sent her home. I forgot to say that she informed us that her mother was with her, and that she was compelled to employ all her time not spent at school in selling newspapers in order to realize a few pennies to support the family. When she left, I turned to my companion and asked him: "Can you understand the inevitable fate that is in store for that poor girl?" And he sprang up with tears in his eyes, saying: "For God's sake let us do something to rescue her." I pulled him back, and I said that is an impulse which is always tugging at my heart when I come down here,—to devote myself to an individual case. It appeals to me because I see it before me. But that is not an isolated case. There are thousands like that in this district—thousands of children that are denied the most sacred privilege that God gives to every girl, to grow up to be a respectable woman, a respectable wife and a respectable mother. I am not unduly earnest when I speak to my friends, to my brethren in all parts of this country, that the care of that child's purity is no more my business because I live in the upper portion of Manhattan Island than it is the care of a Jew who lives in Oregon. It is my business—it always has been my business, whether I live in New York or elsewhere, and what I claim and what I preach as the gospel that animates my soul, is that it is your business, that it is the business of every Jew, if he is entitled to that honorable name. It is not to be left to those people to choose where they shall live. They are unable to form a fair judgment. They are no more qualified to form a fair judgment as to where they shall locate when they land as foreigners from Europe than are your children or my children to determine what is best for them. They must be guided, led until they are strong

enough educationally to move for themselves. They must be educated to a better understanding of the conditions that prevail in the interior of this country, of opportunities offered everywhere for men able to work, to lift themselves and their families. That is an educational campaign which is proceeding systematically, tediously and painfully slow in the lower east side of New York. But there is something more needed than that in order to ameliorate the conditions which obtain in the Ghetto and which are continually being augmented by the fact that the influx from Europe is greater than the efflux from New York. You understand this, who strive to aid those who will move out of the Ghetto. We must realize that not only are the numbers increasing, but the tone constantly being lowered. Is that any concern of yours? Is it less your concern than it is mine?—when I speak of mine I am speaking as a citizen of New York. I think not. I have asked that question, looking into the eyes of Jewish gatherings all over these United States, and I have never received but one answer: That just as truly as it is the business of the New York Jew, it is the business of the American Jew because it is not a local question. It is not at the invitation of New York they come there. It is not a matter of choice upon the part of New York that they land there. I will take that back and explain to you in a moment. But it is due to the fact that the steamship lines terminate at New York. I said I would take it back that it wasn't the choice of New York, because it has been the decision of the charitable Jews of New York that if this tide must come here, and must be handled by the American Jews, it must be dealt with as an American proposition; our energies will be weakened if they come at various sea ports rather than at one; it is better to have them at one place than to divide our forces all along the Atlantic seaboard. But I can say to you that if the Jews of New York had set themselves energetically to the task, we could offer inducements that would compel the immigration companies to divert the immigration to Charleston, to Baltimore, to New Orleans, to Boston, to any place on the American coast, and looked at from a purely financial standpoint, money could not be better invested.

But they have never argued that feature, but, on the contrary, have always taken the position that if we must take care of them, it is better that they come where they can be handled scientifically, than to let them be landed on the seaboard indiscriminately and receive no particular attention.

Now, in New York a great many charitable institutions exist and a very few charitable people. (Applause.) And we are handling problems which impel us to deal with them familiarly; to smile when we hear of troubles that are related at a meeting like this—as obtaining in other communities. When we hear some one speak of these settlement districts in such and such a community, or something or another that is established in some other community, we can not help recalling that not only could we not say *the* settlement house, but those among us who are best informed do not know the location of the many settlement houses which we have in the city of New York and of the Jewish charitable institutions, so numerous are they; and yet so great are the problems that these many institutions scarcely make an impression. When I took a visitor through the Educational Alliance building in New York, and told him the average attendance there was 7,000 a day year in and year out, he was amazed, as almost any one unfamiliar with the situation would be, that it does not make a greater impression upon the tone and the civilization that obtain here, and the answer to it is: That if we had 20 institutions located at proper places in the lower east side of New York, each a duplicate of the Educational Alliance, each one would have a like daily attendance, so stupendous is that problem there. Now to get down to the practical question to which I wish to address myself; it is this: What is the solution, what are we going to do? Now, I want to avoid as much as possible speaking of any matter in which I must employ the personal pronoun I, which, if I had my way about it, would be blotted out of all vocabularies, but I am compelled by circumstances to say that when the Roumanian persecution drove the first installment of victims to the United States in the early part of the summer of 1900, the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith undertook to distribute them in different

localities in the United States, and thereupon organized a movement in conjunction with philanthropic individuals and societies located in the city of New York, and up to the first day of February, 1901, had located in a most desultory and unscientific way somewhere between 1,600 and 2,000 people. Now, you must understand we had no machinery provided for handling such a problem. We had nobody who understood how to handle these people. We did not know whom to employ for that purpose, because there was no one who had had any experience. The people living in the interior of the United States did not understand these people nor how to handle them, and, in the nature of things, mistakes were made and duplicated and multiplied over and over again, but out of all that turmoil and confusion and apparent chaos the fact remains that about 60 per cent, 60 to 66 per cent of those who were moved out were finally successfully located and became self-supporting in different parts of the United States. But quite a large percentage of those who went out did not stay in the places to which they were sent. They drifted. If they were sent within 300 or 400 or 500 miles of Chicago, they had a desire to see Chicago. Most everybody has. Or if they were anywhere near St. Louis, they wanted to go to St. Louis, and they wanted to go to Cincinnati in the same way. The large cities always attract these people, and there was what we called a drift. Somebody said this morning when a man gives $5 to this hospital and $5 to that asylum, and $50 to another, every week, that at the end of the year he thinks he has given away a fortune. He is astonished when you sum up and find out how little his contribution is. Now I am glad that was mentioned, because I have found out that if in January two Roumanians drifted into St. Louis and besieged the relief committee there for aid, and in February one, and in March four, and in April another one or two, before the end of the year, it was firmly believed that all the Roumanians in the country were being dumped into St. Louis. (Laughter and applause.)

When I was in Chicago last March, I was told by the manager of the United Hebrew Charities there that 400 Roumanian

refugees who were sent out by the New York Committee had drifted into Chicago, and I said, "Won't you feel more comfortable if you reduce that?" and he said, "Well, to be certain I would reduce it to 300." Afterwards, through the courtesy of Mr. Senior, President of this organization, I saw the figures, the names of the men tabulated. I do not undertake to be exact, but I am safe in saying that the number that were sent there was under 70, and of that list of 70, we could only check out about 45. There were fewer than 50 who really were sent by the Committee in New York to various parts of the west and who drifted to Chicago. Well, the same was true in Baltimore, and the same was true in Cincinnati, and the same was true everywhere else. In fact, when you tabulate the drift of Roumanians that were sent out, we discover that by some miraculous process these Roumanian refugees had been able to multiply themselves. Well, our figures showed 60 per cent remained where they were, and the other 40 per cent had multiplied themselves into 200 per cent of the whole number. I refer to that because it presents a grave practical problem. What are you going to do about it? After experiences which we profited by, we reorganized our affairs and our statistics from the first of February will show that in our removal work 80 per cent of those who were sent out remained where we had sent them and are self-sustaining and prosperous. We sent out the heads of families. Remember, we never sent anybody to any community without the consent of that community. That is an inflexible rule, but when the head of a family who has gone forth as the pioneer, can get a certificate from the local charitable organization or from the B'nai B'rith Lodge, if there be one, or any other lodge, that he is able to take care of his family, his family is sent to him. Those are what we call reunion cases. And our reunion record confirms beyond any peradventure, the absolute success of this movement. Now, when that movement had been demonstrated as a success, it was suggested that possibly in removal work we could solve the Ghetto problem. We could give the children of those people, herded like cattle, the opportunity to breathe fresh air, to get proper surroundings and proper

educational facilities, to take their places in the rank of American boys and American girls and become worthy American citizens; we urged them to take advantage of the different portions of the United States, and there we had, as we have now, untold obstacles to overcome; and we have gone forth to make a propaganda among the Jews, to impress upon them the duty, nay, more than that, the privilege of taking part in this great historical movement. Stamp your individuality upon it so that your children and children's children may say that there was a time when the exodus was repeated, when the exodus from Spain was repeated, when the Jews moved from Southeastern Europe to the United States, and my father or my grandfather was one of the active spirits in that movement, opening his arms to those refugees, furnishing them with the beginnings of a career and enabling their children to become worthy citizens, whose descendants are now the leaders of Jewish life in the United States. Can you appreciate that? Let me tell you something which brought it to my mind more forcibly: At an early stage of the movement I instructed my secretary to take an ordinary railroad folder, a map of the United States, and mark with a blue pencil the points to which the Roumanian refugees had been sent, so that he might have it as a guide for the work, and I mentioned it casually one day to the Superintendent of the Educational Alliance, a Russian, Dr. Blaustein, and he said, "Let me have that. That little worthless railroad folder will become of priceless value when the Roumanian has become a fixed fact in American civilization. It will be a precious souvenir to their descendants to show how they were first introduced into the interior of the United States and where they first located." Now, I do not appreciate his enthusiasm about the historical value of that little map, but I do say, without respect to any special feature of the work, that the work itself is of great historical significance; it appeals to your emotion; it should appeal to your judgment, and if it does not, it is not the fault of the situation, it is your fault. It would indicate to my mind, and I think it would to the mind of any one of you who is capable of passing upon the subject, that you engaged in charity work

which you are doing for pleasure. Now, there is a great deal of pleasure in charity work. There is a delightful emotion when we do somebody a kindness, and I have observed in myself and in others, too, that we always like to do a kindness to somebody who needs it least. I know when I go down into the Ghetto and I see a group of children, my inclination is to do something for the prettiest child in the group. If you find in a group of men one that looks the most respectable, who is the best dressed, who appeals to you because he has an intelligent face, he is the man that is most likely to arouse your first impulse to aid, but if he is uncomely, if he is untidy and malodorous, why, you turn from him with loathing and disgust; and yet if you are animated by the true spirit of charity, you ought to reflect that the one from whom you turn in loathing and disgust is the one that is most entitled to your assistance. The other man can get along himself. (Applause.) To do true charity work is to make sacrifice. What values it to sit down in your comfortable office and write a check and flutter it out, to avoid coming in contact with those cases because it may soil your gloves; to deal with them with tongs, to write magazine theses on charity work—beautiful specimens of literature such as I have heard and seen time and time again, and possessing great merit? It endures forever, because it is not subjected to wear and tear. But if you want to do effective charity work you must soil your hands. You must come into contact with things that are loathsome and repulsive, and feel you are giving of your own comfort and happiness in order to secure comfort and well-being to others. I have always said it is no holiday business. It is not a holiday jaunt. It means trouble. It means a tax on your patience. It means you are going to be betrayed. It means you are going to be the subject of ingratitude and treachery and a thousand other things that will make you recoil because you must not expect these people to be perfect specimens of humanity. Why should you? Are those who have lived with you in your own community, are they perfect, are they all sensible, are they all truthful, are they all upright, are they all courteous, are they all loyal? and you will

answer no, a thousand times no, and if that be true of the average of any community, how should you expect these poor, persecuted refugees who come over here should measure up to a loftier standard than that which you apply to your own people?

Now I want you to reflect on that because that is of great weight, not because it comes from me, but because it will help you in your work. You will observe, in dealing with the prejudices of our Gentile friends towards the Jews, they always insist upon comparing the average Jew with the best Christian. And, of course, that is manifestly unfair. And the American Jew compares the Russian and Roumanian Jew with the best American Jew. But if you compare averages, I think you will find the scale will not tip much one way or the other. (Applause.) I heard this morning a question put to one of the distinguished delegates of this conference: How can we bridge the chasm between the Russian and the German Jew? How can we get rid of the prejudices which exist on both sides? And I was delighted when I heard the interrogation coupled with the statement of the prejudices which exist on both sides, and I was pained to hear a reply made which would indicate that the prejudice only existed on one side, and that it was well grounded. I have had to deal with that problem and to study it, and I have found that the closer I got into it, the nearer I got to the fact that the prejudices on the part of the Russian Jew towards the American and the German Jew are absolutely well founded from his viewpoint. And that the prejudice of the American and the German Jew against the Russian and the Galician and the Roumanian Jew is absolutely well founded from the viewpoint of the American and the German Jew. But I have always found that both viewpoints are wrong, and that if those who settle the question will take a broad view of it, will separate themselves from prejudices, and look at the underlying facts, they will find there is a misunderstanding which should be removed; that the Russian should not be driven to the loss of self-respect by the arrogant assumption of superiority on the part of the German or the American Jew. Right there is perhaps the main root of the evil. These people will not tell you

so to your face, but they understand your arrogance, and they will have nothing to do with you as long as you assume to patronize them from the standpoint of superiority. They do not recognize your superiority, and I do not blame them. On the other hand, they do not participate in our charities to the extent you think they ought, and you censure them. I think they ought to participate more than they do. I think that also of the American and the German Jew. I want to make this observation as applicable to New York—I do not know whether it applies to St. Louis. I will say it is applicable to New York, and I will call your attention to the proof of the truth of it. The Jewish population of New York may be divided into three parts Russian and the allied races to one part of the American and the German Jew. That is to say, 350,000 to 120,000, or in that proportion, three to one. And I will say this, that of the 350,000 or 300,000 of Russian, Galician and Roumanian Jews in New York, there are fewer who are able to contribute to organized charities, yet do not, than there are among the 120,000 German and American Jews who are able to do it and do not. I know that between 5,000 and 6,000 names is the largest we can muster as contributors to organized charities in the great city of New York. How is it with other large cities? Take the lists and compare them with the lists of the American and German Jews, and ask yourself whether it is not proper to sweep a little before our own doors before we comment upon the accumulated dirt before the doors of our neighbors. We must deal with this question in a catholic spirit. We must remember a man can not get to the top unless he climbs from the bottom. We must remember those who came to this country 50 years ago had to climb from the bottom to the top, and we ought to be manly enough to know there is nothing more cowardly and disgraceful than to climb to the top of a wall by a ladder and then kick the ladder away so that nobody can climb up afterwards. (Applause.) Now, in a great many of the communities great work has been done. One of those who addressed you a few minutes ago, a representative from Pittsburg, himself a Roumanian, has successfully taken hold of the work in Pittsburg under the lead-

ership of Mr. Rosenbaum, the President of the B'nai B'rith district No. 3, of which Philadelphia is the capital city, who is here, and I hope he will have occasion to tell you from the standpoint of the American native Jew something about co-operation in this work of establishing refugees in different parts of the country. We have other friends who have done so. But we have some natives to deal with that are as ignorant, apparently, as the most benighted Jew that ever lived in Southeastern Europe, whose horizon is the limited local community; who do not understand that beyond the hilltops which limit their view there are other people; who can be uplifted to a realization of the fact that the Jewish question is a question pertaining to all the Jews; that the concern of all the Jews is the concern of each Jew, and the concern of each Jew is the concern of all Jews. They will tell you, whenever a propaganda is sought to be made among them, that they have their local troubles, and as soon as they do their part with those who are immediately with them, they perform their full duty, and I say they do not know what trouble is. I called the attention of my friends from New York before we left New York to this: When you come out to Detroit and meet the representatives from the west and south and listen to the recital of their so-called troubles, you will find they have no trouble. It reminds me, when I heard the recital from Kansas City this morning, of the bright side work in a certain Sabbath School where some young teacher conceived the idea of putting herself in communication with the managers of the hospitals of New York to ascertain the wants of patients and on Sunday morning she came before the assembled children and she said: "Here is a little child with curvature of the spine; she broke her doll the other day and she wants a new doll with blue eyes and black hair—now who will furnish that?" And immediately there was an array of little hands raised up. Every little girl in the Sunday school wanted to furnish that doll. Well, there is a little boy in another hospital who wants a ball. And there, again, the little hands go, and everybody wants to furnish the ball. Of course, only one can do so; and it seems as if the rest did not meet with the favor of the teacher, and their eyes filled

with tears, and they go home very much disappointed, because there was not enough trouble to go around. Now, let me say to you, my friends, in the communities where there is not enough trouble to go around, it is your duty to hold up your hands like those children, and to clamor for your share. And there is plenty of it to go around if it is properly distributed. And the work that I and my friends are engaged in is to bring about a proper distribution that you shall understand that that condition which prevails there in New York is not our problem. It is your problem. It is the problem of all of us. It is your burden as it is our burden; and that you can not get rid of your responsibility simply because you do not see it, or because you live a thousand miles away from it. Be manly and womanly, and face the situation, and when you realize your duty either you will perform it, or not perform it, but do not indulge in sophistries and fallacies, and say it is no concern of yours. Now, I do not want to be invidious; I do not want to mention names, but I do wish to say there are communities in these United States that have insisted repeatedly that we of New York are trying to unload our troubles on other communities, and that they were not going to be used as a dumping-ground for the poverty-stricken Jews of New York. Now, let me tell you how much proof there is to any such accusation. I have already told you they are coming to New York at the rate of 50,000 a year. Our scheme of removal involves the removing of 2,400 a year, so you can see how much disposed we are to unload our burden upon the country. We are very much concerned in not creating a congestion elsewhere. We are very much concerned in properly distributing these people; we are very much concerned in looking after their welfare after they go beyond the confines of New York, so much so that we will never send to any community without its consent, and we are not urging communities to take more than they can properly care for. On the contrary, time and time again, when small towns have said we will take care of ten, or any particular number, our experience shows and we have told them you can not stand up under such a burden as that. Take a smaller number first. Our problem is an old problem. We

think we are broad enough to grasp it; we are trying to teach the breadth and depth of that problem to the Jews in other parts of the United States, and it is unfair to themselves and to us to belittle it with a discussion of little details—the consideration of little trifles and little mistakes made in the movement. Mistakes, of course! You could not conduct a big business without making mistakes. You could not conduct a great enterprise like this without mistakes. And when you reflect that the people who are engaged in this work are without the hope of any kind of reward, you ought not to be unforgiving towards their errors, even though you be infallible yourself. (Long continued applause.)

UNION AMONG JEWS.

Oration delivered by Brother Leo N. Levi, President of Executive Committee, I. O. B. B., at the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of District Grand Lodge No. 1, I. O. B. B., Sunday, March 8th, 1903, at Temple Beth-el.

BRETHREN AND FRIENDS:

The celebration in which we are engaged is not merely a festive occasion. We are not assembled chiefly for pleasurable entertainment. We have been called together to review what we have done and have left undone; to take an account of what we are doing and leaving undone and to make a budget, as it were, of what the future holds for us to do. In such deliberations we hold no secret conclaves. We present our history with all its successes and its failure to the public; and along with it we set forth the scope and plan of our future activities. It is an appropriate time to reconsider first principles, however well they may seem to be settled; to answer any challenge which the world can make to us, and in turn to issue our own challenge to the world.

One of the features of this jubilee is a history of District No. 1, prepared by brethren identified with it from the beginning, and who can acquaint us from their own recollections with the spirit in which the District was formed. I shall not enter the field which they have so well covered, except to pluck here and there a sheaf from the harvests they have gathered.

From that history we learn that after the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith had been in successful existence for some years, it was found expedient, for purposes of practical administration, to create territorial districts in which it might operate with a due regard to local considerations. The First and Second Districts were simultaneously established in 1851. Since then five other districts in the United States and three in Europe have

been established. None which was created has ceased to exist.

While the first and second districts were officially born at the same time, District No. 1 has always been looked upon as the Mother District. The Order had its genesis and first growth in the City of New York. Thence it spread to the various Jewish communities in the United States and Canada. When it covered so large a territory that government could not be effectively administered from New York, the first subdivision took place and District No. 1 assumed the same relation to the rest of the country that Virginia bore to the states which were carved out of her vast domain.

When in the course of time the present Constitution was adopted for the Order at large, it was modeled after the organic law of the United States, the Districts being the analogue of the States, and the Constitution Grand Lodge represented by its Executive Committee, being the analogue of the Federal Government. The seat of the Constitution Grand Lodge has always been in New York City, where the Order had its birth. The first President of the Executive Committee was chosen from District No. 1, and he continued to serve until his years and physical infirmities compelled him to resign the burdens of his office. Even then, the Order was unwilling to part with his services. An office was created in which, like another Nestor, he could enrich our councils with his wisdom.

Without adducing further testimony, I shall ask you to conclude with me, that the relations between District No. 1 and the entire Order have been so interwoven that it is impossible to speak of the one without the other. This celebration, therefore, while in a sense local to this District, is in a broader sense a celebration of and by the Order. This District has been the pioneer in the great movements which, for good and for evil, have marked the history of our organization. It does not claim unmerited honors or shrink from grave responsibilities. Those who have formed its rank and file for fifty years and more have labored earnestly in a great cause. They have won many victories and suffered some defeats. They are not more proud of the former than sorrowful for the latter. What they have done

and what they have left undone is all set down, to be read by those who follow them. They do not demand praise or resent criticism, but they ask that criticism shall be constructive and not destructive; that it shall be offered in order to build up and not to tear down. This at least is their due, unless, indeed, they have builded from the beginning on a false foundation or have unwisely continued the organization after the reason for its existence had ceased. To these considerations we may address ourselves with profit to-day, as if the world had challenged us again to justify the establishment of our organization when it was formed, or its continued existence.

Shortly before the middle of the nineteenth century, the Jewish colony in the City of New York had grown to considerable proportions, but it lacked cohesion. It was composed of elements which, if not altogether discordant, were at least not homogenous. It embraced the Sephardim or Portuguese Jews who held themselves aloof from and superior to all others; English Jews who were insular in their ideas; German Jews who resented the arrogance of the Sephardim, but who themselves arrogated superiority over the Poles, and lastly, the Polish Jews, who sneered at the assumptions of the Portuguese, English and German Jews. It embraced some men of culture in the broadest sense, others of great scholarship in a limited and Jewish sense only, and still a greater number of the ignorant and unrefined. In the colony were some who were animated by a lofty but liberal religious spirit, others who were fanatically pious, and still others who were in every way irreligious. These are but some of the differences which operated against harmonious co-operation. Small groups were formed, based in each instance upon something common to the members thereof, and these groups were jealous of and in a measure hostile towards one another. Despite these differences, each Jew was at some time or another reminded that over and above them existed the community of sentiment and interest which inevitably obtains among all classes of Jews. The Jews are and ever have been a peculiar people. If they ever forget it for a moment, the world rudely reminds them of it. Men may differ as to the underlying

causes, but not as to the fact itself. It may be because God chose the Jews as a Nation of Priests; it may be because they are narrow minded and arrogant; it may be because the world hates and persecutes them; at all events they are and ever have been a distinct portion of the human family. This fact may be unfortunate, deplorable and even blame-worthy, but it is a fact. If it be desirable to overcome it, the method has not yet been discovered. The Jews will not surrender their religion, and so long as they cling to it, they must face a hostile world.

This hostility takes little, if any, account of individuals. It is directed not alone against the ignorant, the degraded, the fanatical, the uncultured and the avaricious; it does not except the educated, the lofty, the liberal, the refined and the philanthropic. It disregards all these distinctions and makes of all Jews one target. At times in some countries this hostility slumbers and apparently dies, but it is never universally quiescent. It is always to be found somewhere, and wherever it has seemingly been allayed, there has from time to time been a recrudescence. From some quarter at all times, and from all quarters at some times, it arises like an engulfing flood. And so through the bitter centuries the Jews have learned the fraternity which comes from a common peril.

Each Jew carries the burden imposed upon him by the unfriendliness of the world at large. The superior Jew staggers under an additional load. He carries the infirmities of his inferior brethren. He must be not only thrice better than a Gentile to be as good, he must also uplift all other Jews lest they drag him down. If he be learned he must impart his learning to the ignorant; if he be strong he must uphold the weak; if he be rich he must aid the poor; if he be brave he must inspirit the timid. Each is responsible for all and all for each. It is a terrible handicap, perhaps a grossly unjust one, but in the race of life it has been so established and so it remains. It may be a blessing rather than a curse. Perhaps to the necessities which beset the Jew are due his best qualities.

Until the nineteenth century the Jewish religion was alone sufficient to insure among Jews in particular localities, cohesion

and harmony. Beyond these localities such cohesion and harmony were not deemed necessary, nor were they feasible. Communication and travel were so difficult that anything beyond local organization was not to be considered. With the nineteenth century, two new factors of controlling importance entered into the history of the Jews.

The steam engine and the telegraph wire brought the Jews of different countries into close touch. They were no longer strangers. The Jewish community which in former generations did not extend beyond the confines of a city or a province, widened out so as to embrace continents. The other new factor was the birth of what has come to be called Reformed Judaism. When the Rabbis began to dispute with acrimony about Judaism, the laymen threw off the controlling influence not only of the Rabbis, but of Judaism also. Over night, as it were, it was found that the Jews of the world formed a single community, and that the traditional bond which united them was being cut, untied or worn away.

In New York City, at the period to which I refer, these factors were most strongly in evidence. Facilities of travel had brought here Jews from all parts of the world. They brought with them different customs, habits of thought, phases of religious belief, intellectual acquirements and inherited prejudices. Each group sought to dominate the others, controversies arose, and not only disintegration but destruction was threatened. But above the din and confusion arose one clear note that has sounded throughout the ages. "Though some of you be rich and others poor, some intelligent and others ignorant, some refined and others uncultivated, some pious and others irreligious, some niggard and others generous; though ye speak different tongues, worship according to different rituals and have different habits, yet have ye a common ancestry, a common religion, a common history, a common peril and a common destiny, for ye are all Jews."

Upon this community it was possible—nay necessary to build.—

The dead must be buried, the sick nursed, the poor aided,

the widow comforted, the orphan reared, the ignorant educated, the debased uplifted, the weak protected, and the welfare of all safeguarded from the assaults to which then, as always, it was subject. Therefore wisdom dictated that all points of cleavage be eliminated and an effective union established upon a platform acceptable to all. Towards this end leading minds groped at first and later advanced with rapid strides. Great institutions are not created; they grow.

A few men organized on the lines just indicated. They themselves did not grasp the importance of their work. They builded better than they knew. In the first Constitution of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, the central thought was that of a Union of the Sons of the Covenant. All other ideas were to be subordinated to the importance of Union. Its scope was limited to this country, and its main purpose as stated, to secure "a dignified representation of the Israelites of America in a religious and social point of view and the elevation of the masses in a moral and intellectual direction."

The first Constitution discloses that its authors were not altogether at home in the English language and that their thoughts had not yet been clarified by experience and discussion. But it is manifest that they had a great ideal and that they succeeded in communicating it to others. The success of the organization was pronounced and immediate.

It was the first effort in the history of the Jews to organize them as such, on lines not exclusively religious or local. In its success the Jews discovered themselves in a new light. They found that their weakness could be changed into strength and that the best elements among them could be employed to improve the tone of the worst.

After the lapse of some years experience suggested many improvements in administrative methods, and a clearer, broader and more definite declaration of principles. The present Constitution was the result. Its author, Julius Bien, the present Chancellor of Foreign Affairs, grasped and expressed the genius of the Order. What was originally a nebulous union of only local importance, he made a well defined organization to operate through-

out the world. The preamble cannot be too often repeated. As a declaration of principles it is comprehensively perfect.

"The Independent Order of B'nai B'rith has taken upon itself the mission of uniting Israelites in the work of promoting their highest interests and those of humanity; of developing, elevating and defending the mental and moral character of our race, of inculcating the purest principles of philanthropy, honor and patriotism; of supporting science and art; alleviating the wants of the poor and needy; visiting and attending the sick; coming to the rescue of victims of persecution; providing for, protecting and assisting the widow and orphan on the broadest principles of humanity."

That the union of Jews on this platform was justified, desirable and even necessary, requires no further argument, except to those who in some shadowy way, oppose all distinctions among men on account of religion, race, color or nationality. With such, discussion is futile. They are wedded to the conviction that there should be no organizations which recognize any distinctions whatsoever. To them even patriotism, if they be logical, is narrow and inhumane. They believe that the brotherhood of man makes a brotherhood of Jews indefensible, forgetful that the same faith would place a blood brother on an equality with an utter stranger. If, however, the wisdom of forming this Union requires evidence, as well as argument to support it, that evidence is supplied by the history of our Order and of this District. Read that history and learn of the results accomplished in works of benevolence, local, national and international. Read of our Home for the Aged—of our Maimonides Free Library—of our Benevolent Funds—of our aid in the erection and conduct of eleemosynary institutions—of our efforts in the cause of education—of our share in securing treaty rights for our oppressed co-religionists in Roumania—of our part in the Centennial celebration of the nation, and many other potent expressions of our activity. But far greater than these achievements has been the influence exerted in the lodge room by those whose good influence was needed by others. Our organization has brought into contact those who were able to help, and those who needed help. It

brought about association and affiliation under circumstances which repressed the evil and exalted the good in human nature.

Unceasingly it has made for the good and spiritual and has made against the sordid and material. It served to develop intelligence and character and aided in the discovery of trustworthy leaders. To those qualified to lead it has offered a following and an opportunity. No one who reads our history can resist the conclusion that but for our organization the status of the Jew would in all respects, be lower than it is.

In claiming so much, we are not unmindful of the errors that we have made. It is frankly admitted that we have not always pursued the wisest course. Most notable among these errors was the endowment plan, under which life insurance benefits were provided for members. This plan proved unwise in two aspects. In the first place it was faulty as a financial measure, and secondly it was a departure from the true purpose of the association. It undoubtedly distracted the attention of the members and estranged many desirable persons whose affiliation would have been otherwise secured. It is easier to confess the error, because we have survived and corrected it. After many years of painful effort, and more painful endurance, we are emerging from an evil which well nigh worked our destruction. Nothing could better evidence the real merit and vitality of our Organization, than its survival of the Endowment folly. Happily we may speak of it as a disease which has spent its course and from which we are convalescent.

It remains to answer the challenge to our continued existence. It has been urged that conditions have so altered since our birth, that we have no warrant to persevere. This superficial criticism has lost even its apparent force during the past few years. But a short while back and especially in New York, it was said that our charities are being satisfactorily conducted by separate societies having special aims; "our community is so large that groups are necessary and any comprehensive union undesirable; anti-semitism is dying out; the American Jew has no problems except such as are local; the influence of the lodge-room is no longer required or beneficial—in short, there is noth-

ing to be done, your mission is ended and you should pass out of existence." Since then the Dreyfus agitation in France has demonstrated that anti-semitism is likely to break out at any time and place and that when it finds the Jews without organization their plight is pitiful indeed. Since then the refugees from Russia, Galicia and Roumania have raised the Jewish question to commanding importance. Since then it has dawned on the world that we are witnessing another exodus which promises to soon change the habitat of the Jews to the Western Hemisphere. Since then we have come to understand that in New York City there have come and remained more Jews than have been together at any one time and place, since the destruction of Jerusalem. Since then we have seen disasters working ruin to whole communities of Jews. Since then we have found it necessary to fight persecution in Europe and to relieve its victims here. Since then we have been busy finding homes throughout the world for Jews driven from Eastern Europe. Since then we are beset by an increase of the poor, of the widowed, of the orphaned and of the sick—and here in New York especially we have learned that these are not problems of merely local concern. The conditions which have congested the Jewish population of New York, and the conditions resulting therefrom, touch the life, happiness and destiny of the Jews throughout the world. The tragedy of the Jew is again to the fore, and he must realize that, under the favor of Heaven, he must rely upon himself to avert or ameliorate its horrors. To do this, individuals or isolated groups are powerless. There must be co-operation among all Jews. In short, to be strong we must be united.

When crises arise it is too late to organize. Organization must be prepared in advance. No one has ever claimed perfection for our Order as an agency for solving practical problems, but at all events it has come to be recognized as the best we have. It was the first widespread Jewish organization; it has endured; it has noble traditions and a great history; it is established throughout the world; it was and is available. Hence the critics were silenced; the rusty hinges were oiled; the broken places repaired, and the machinery so long inactive, because not in de-

mand, began the task which, except by organized effort, was unsurmountable.

Let facts—facts yet so fresh that they have scarcely become history—seal the warrant for our existence. How fairly they stand forth to witness for us. The list is too long to be fully told. A few must suffice. Let the hundreds of Jewish families who were given a new start in life after the Galveston flood testify for us. Call the many thousand Roumanian Refugees who have been established in this blessed land, to give testimony. Let the protest of our Government against the persecution of the Jews in Europe be read in evidence. Let the awakening among our brethren in the so-called "Ghetto" silence the last doubt.

But, say the critics, if your achievements be recognized and your purposes appreciated, yet must you be condemned as a secret body, indulging in the nonsense of a ritual of ceremony. Good purposes shun not the light of day and symbols are relics of a barbarous age. So long as these are retained the best exemplars of the Jews will not join your Union.

To these a simple answer is at hand. Our organization is not a union of men already perfect. It is not an end itself, but only the means to an end. It seeks rather than expresses the ideal. It is a practical device to make men better, not a mere agency for exhibiting men who are in need of no improvement. It is not an aristocracy of brains or virtue. It is essentially democratic. It unites all classes to the end that the good may improve the evil and the best the good. Being so designed, it cannot be fashioned or conducted to suit the views of the few. It must be adapted to its purposes and to its constituents. Those who mothered and nursed it, took counsel from the pages of history. They learned that laws, regulations and customs, sacred or profane, if made for those only who stand least in need thereof, will utterly fail to reach those who most require them. They knew that the complete code contained in the Decalogue would have been cold, meaningless and ineffective, if it had not been fused into the very life of Israel by the fire of religious ceremonies. They remembered that when the early Christians builded up a great religion upon the martyrdom of a Jew, they made it learn-

able to the heathen, by incorporating even heathen observances into those of the church.

The theory of government, of religion and of moral education is simple, but to make them practically vital, the dreamer in the study must become a student of men, as well as of ideas. Even if it be conceded that as the world advances, the charm of mystery and of symbols will cease, we are yet far from that day. The strongest organizations today are those which recognize this charm, and if we reflect deeply, we must recognize that all men and all nations are within its influence. When Victoria died, Edward became King of England and Emperor of India by lawful succession. Nothing was required to make his titles good in law or fact; yet from all quarters of the globe the richest and wisest streamed to participate in or witness the pageant of his Coronation as King and the solemn proclamation of his accession as Emperor. Men may smile or sneer at such ceremonies as absurd, but no practical man of affairs can ignore their importance, so long as they have a hold upon the masses. While we seek to make men wiser and better, we must deal with them as they are. If we refuse to do so, we shall enjoy no opportunities to influence them at all.

And now, when we have answered those who challenge us, what can they say to the challenge we make to them?

The Independent Order of B'nai B'rith is the first and only organization of Jews, extending throughout the world, and designed to unite all Jews for the purposes set forth in its preamble. It has passed the experimental stage. It has proved that such a union is a necessity. It has no rival. Its failure would be a calamity; its success has been and is a blessing. It stands full of courage and hope, confronting vast problems that only union and organization can grapple with.

Five million Jews in Europe are suffering from poverty and the denial of equal rights. A million Jews in this country and the tremendous annual accessions to their numbers must be guided and welded into an ultimate civilization which shall be alike adorned by patriotism and the traditional virtues of Israel. The poor, the widows, the orphans, the sick, the ignorant and

the downtrodden, must be looked after, congested districts must be relieved, homes established, evil tendencies checked, virtues implanted and fostered. In a word, never has the need been greater to carry the extra weight which now, as ever, is placed upon the Jew. Ours is an army, organized to war upon sorrow, ignorance and immorality. The recruits are offered no glittering rewards. It is a service of love, duty and sacrifice. The offer we extend is not so much of privilege as responsibility; not so much of reward as burden. Who feels the blood of his ancestors beat in harmony with Jewish traditions, who hears in the cry of sorrow the call to sacrifice, who feels the thrall of duty and can find exaltation in the humility of self-effacement; who is not ready to surrender his birthright, rather than defend it; who has within him the Jewish spirit which has tired Time and Torture, let him enlist. Here especially is it needful that our ranks should grow. Here, and in the near future, will be the storm center of the Jewish question.

Like a mighty torrent, events are rushing upon us. We must battle with disease, poverty, immorality, ignorance, crime and debasement. The prospect is truly appalling. But God helps those who help themselves. If we bear up bravely, if we increase the helpers, we shall speedily reduce the number of those who need help. If we meet problems, instead of flying from them, we shall master them. Prudence, wisdom, duty—all direct our course. As in all ages, the multitude will hang back, but now as in all ages there will be those who vindicate man as the image of his Maker.

JUDAISM IN AMERICA.

FROM JHE

STANDPOINT OF A LAYMAN.

Address of Leo N. Levi, Esq., delivered at the Council of Union of American Hebrew Congregations, in New Orleans, December 4, 1894.

Mr. President and Gentlemen:—Had I consulted my personal and private interests only, I should have declined to address you on this occasion. Even the honor I now enjoy, than which I esteem none higher, could not have tempted me to make the sacrifices which my presence involves.

One consideration alone impelled me to set aside personal interests and to accept the invitation extended by your president.

I recognized then as I do now, that here would be convened a body which represents Judaism and the Jews of America. To those Jews and concerning that Judaism, I have a message which, humble and modest as it is, I believed and believe it my duty to deliver. To you as the agents and envoys of your constituents, I shall entrust it, in the hope that when it shall have reached its destination it will at least quicken thought upon a subject of the gravest moment.

When I reflect upon the purposes of this organization and the effective and enduring character of its work I am impressed with the propriety of discussing in its councils whatever touches nearly the destiny of our ancient religion. You who have busied yourselves with equipping teachers in Israel, will not deem it beyond your province to consider what is being and what should be taught to and by those teachers.

From every Jewish pulpit we are wont to hear our shortcomings and sins inquired into and condemned. Our want of piety and virtue is rebuked and we are asked by our spiritual advisers

to make our practices consistent with the faith we profess. From their exalted positions the Rabbis in turn lead and drive us, with appeals and denunciations, and we hearken and heed or remain obdurate, as the case may be, with never an opportunity to say one word by way of rejoinder.

Today, from this rostrum, in the presence of and in the name of the laymen of our faith, I venture for once to "talk back."

As children we were taught a simple faith from a simple catechism, prepared by those charged with the duty of studying, knowing and expounding the religion of our fathers. The education bestowed upon us by our progenitors we in turn must bestow upon our descendants. We cannot escape the obligation if we would, we would not if we could. Neither can we escape the obligation to be honest with our children, and to require their teachers to be honest with us. It is our duty as it is our privilege when we have reached man's estate, to catechise those who have catechised us and who will catechise our children. We are entitled to know what we are asked to believe and why. We are entitled to know what our teachers believe and why, and when we ask we are entitled to replies that even our children can comprehend, instead of answers that not even we can understand.

When the mocking heathen came to Shammai with his sneering question the irascible sage smote him for his effrontery, but even to him the gentle Hillel found it proper to teach our faith. If the mocker could move the great teacher to expound the law to his comprehension, shall we hesitate to ask with reverence for light? If this were an open question the answer would be ready and plain, but unfortunately precedents prove that our rights in this respect are not admitted. If we seek for light we are deemed presumptuous, and, figuratively at least, meet too often the fate which the heathen experienced at the hands of Shammai.

Not the least, if not the most, remarkable feature in the intellectual development of the nineteenth century, is the disposition to set aside everything that is ancient in order to make room for something that is modern. So prevalent is this disposition that even in mechanical arts and sciences, in which fundamental principles have been tested until their correctness can no longer be

questioned, these principles are ruthlessly set aside, by daring innovators, in order that they may exploit some novelty, with which to startle the world.

And so it may be said, that while the discoveries and inventions of the present era eclipse all those that have preceded it, nevertheless it is true that worthless novelties are more prevalent now than at any time past. If we boast, as we well may, of the remarkable achievements of science with which our age has been blessed, we must not forget that in every civilized country the patent offices are packed from cellar to dome with inventions that are without merit, and that these discarded inventions out-number those in use in such a vast proportion as to afford food for serious reflection.

It is not, however, with innovations, discoveries and inventions, in the material world that I have to deal in the present discussion. I have only referred thereto to show how all-pervasive is the spirit of discovery, the thirst for novelty and the desire for innovation during the last half of the nineteenth century.

Outside the physical and material sciences the spirit already adverted to has manifested itself with even greater emphasis. No doctrine, however time-honored, no law, however well established, no principle however completely demonstrated, has been allowed to go unchallenged during the tremendous revolution that obtains in our times. Perhaps in religion more than in any other department of human affairs has the revolutionary tendency been felt. In America especially, with a boldness that is startling, if not admirable, daring minds have assaulted every tenet of every religion with a recklessness that suggests that novelty rather than truth is the goal of their efforts. Even the Jews who have always been distinguished for conservatism have not escaped the prevalent tendency. In all ages the Jews have been noted for rising superior to the errors of their time, and preserving in their purity the laws, doctrines and practices of their ancient faith. Their philosophy, founded as it is upon their religion, has withstood with varying firmness, but with uniform ultimate success, the assaults made upon it during the ages by every system of adverse philosophy, skepticism or unbelief. Even in the present era, the

vast majority of contemporary Jews are moving serenely onward, unaffected so far as their religion and philosophy are concerned, by the storms that rage around them. But in America and notably in the United States a large number of more or less enlightened Jews have surrendered themselves to the reckless and intoxicating thirst for novelty, and have laid rude hands upon everything and anything that offered an opportunity for exploitation. Whatever is ancient is by them considered banal, and therefore regarded as beneath the dignity of an age that riots in the drunkenness of the present, without respect for the past or the future.

The movement in which these Jews are and have been engaged is not factive, but altogether destructive. It does not build up, but tears down. Moreover, its destructive processes are without any rule or system, apparently having no other object than to destroy. And when the destruction is complete, there does not arise upon the ruins of what has been destroyed any new structure brought about by any process, either natural or factitious, but on the contrary the destroyers reveling amidst the ruins they have made, challenge the amazement and demand the admiration of those who have witnessed their performance by pointing to the destruction that they have wrought. They seem to thirst for a celebrity that to most men would be odious, and might well exclaim that, "The aspiring youth who fired the Ephesan dome outlives in fame the pious fool who reared it."

It must not be understood, however, from the foregoing remarks that I undervalue the achievements of this century or the spirit which made them possible. Considered within its proper limits, the ambitious spirit of the nineteenth century must always remain to pale the past and light the future. It has advanced civilization more in a single generation than was its progress for centuries before. It has uncovered many falsehoods and destroyed them to make room for truths. It has engendered the spirit of toleration and the recognition of human liberty, for which we can never be too grateful. It is not with the true spirit of reform that any rational man can find fault, for the progress of civilization from the earliest time to the present received its impulse from reform ideas. But there is reform, and reform. There

is reform and there is revolution. There always travels side by side with true reform a lawless spirit of wanton destructiveness just as marauding parties accompany a regular army.

Recurring to the Jews in America, and their participation in modern progress and modern methods, it is my purpose to consider the effect of it, especially upon the Jewish religion. From the earliest times there have existed differences of opinion among learned and pious Jews in respect of religious matters. The religious literature of the Jews could scarcely have arisen but for such differences of opinion. Certainly no one who is familiar with the history of the Jews and the Jewish religion could, for one moment, question the recognized right of individual judgment. It is well, however, to ascertain the nature of the differences which have obtained from time to time among the Jews, how they arose, by what standard they were tested, and how they were disposed of. These differences may be divided for convenience into three classes.

First—Differences as to the true interpretation of portions of the Pentateuch.

In respect of these it may be said that learned and pious men, recognizing the divine source and authority of the five books of Moses as containing the law, differed as to the meaning of certain passages found in the law. By some the narrative portion of the Pentateuch was construed literally, by others figuratively. So, with ordinances contained in the Torah. But in all such cases and in respect of all such differences it may be said, without fear of contention, that the Pentateuch itself was referred to as the basis of discussion, it being recognized by all the disputants as the obligatory and God-given law.

Second—There were differences, and always have been, as to the binding force of traditional doctrines and practices not directly enjoined in the scriptures themselves. These doctrines and practices arose from interpretations of the scriptures by learned and pious men, and were frequently, if not generally, promulgated by reason of some local circumstance or environment. As to the continued and binding force of such doctrines and practices, there have always been differences of opinion, and these

opinions have been tested by reference to the Pentateuch itself, which, in all such discussions, has been regarded as the binding and God-given law.

Third—There have always been differences of opinion relative to changes in liturges and ceremonies, brought about by altered conditions, due to the progress of civilization. Much acrimony has been developed by such differences; learned disquisitions have been made in consequence thereof, but the differences have always been considered in the light of the Torah, and the discussion has been whether they were in consonance with or opposition thereto. To anyone, therefore, who studies Judaism, the conclusion is inevitable that considered as a practical religion there is no rigidity about it. It is eminently a flexible and conforming religion insofar as it affects the habits of the people and their rites, ceremonies and practices. It has for its primal object the harmony between man and God, and between man and his fellow-men, and it has adjusted itself throughout all the ages by slow and logical processes, to every environment in which it found itself situated. But in so doing it must always be remembered that it did not lose sight of its fundamental and cardinal doctrines and practices.

The differences to which I have referred, all and always arose in reference to matters not affecting the integrity of the Pentateuch or its authority as determining the essentials and criteria of Judaism. When I say this, however, I am not unmindful of the fact that throughout the history of the Jews there have arisen Jews by race who have assaulted Judaism itself. In almost every age there have arisen men born of Jewish parents who, contaminated by neighboring tribes or other religions, or imbued with a skeptical spirit, have made war upon the fundamental and essential doctrines and practices of Judaism. But in every such instance they were regarded and treated as foes of Judaism, and there arose champions of the ancient faith to do battle with the enemy, and in every instance those who sought to overthrow it were vanquished.

Aaron was a priest in Israel. He was a brother of Israel's greatets law-giver and prophet, and in the performance of his

priestly functions, for the worship of the Jews, set up a golden calf. This, however, was not Judaism, and when Moses returned from his visit to Sinai, he overcame the idolatrous tendency and restored pure Monotheism as the cardinal underlying principle of the Jewish religion.

In the histories of Hezekhiah, Josiah, Elijah, Isaiah, Zachariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Malachi, and a host of other kings and prophets, of Israel, we may find multiplied instances of similar nature. In all of them the integrity of Judaism was endangered by descendants of Israel, whose efforts were frustrated by Jews, who not only inherited the blood, but also the faith of their fathers, and who were ever ready to shed the former to preserve the latter. Such precedents may serve as a warning against, but never as a warrant for, their repetition.

From what has preceded, we may safely apply to any departure from what is time honored and traditional in Judaism, the following tests:

1. Does the innovation proposed involve an assault upon the integrity and binding force of the Torah? or,

2. Is it simply a reform in some matters of ritual or ceremony not directly commanded in the Torah? or,

3. Is it merely a criticism of some interpretation of the scriptures, which the critic deems to be inaccurate? and in this connection, does the criticism proceed within the scriptures or is it launched at them from without? In other words, is it a matter affecting the meaning of the law, without impairing its validity?

If the innovation belong to either of the last two, it must be regarded as a matter of opinion, within the pale of Judaism, warranted by the progress of Judaism in the past; and even though differences engendered by such innovation may remain irreconcilable among the Jews, yet they cannot be regarded as inconsistent with Judaism. For example, there are Jews who contend, most earnestly, that the Creator must be worshipped with covered heads, who deny the right of the sexes to worship together, who insist that flesh of animals and milk shall not be partaken of at the same meal, who deem it sinful to write, smoke, cut, ride, sew or strike a match on the Sabbath day, even if no labor be in-

volved. On the other hand there are Jews who take issue with the former upon all of the contentions just mentioned. Here we have differences of construction. The hermeneutics of one party does not reach the same conclusion as the hermeneutics of another, but both are agreed that the law is contained in the Pentateuch; that when it is understood it is binding, and that it does not lie within the province of man to overthrow the law or deny its authority. They both treat it as the courts of the country treat the acts of the legislature. The several courts or judges may differ in their interpretation of the legislative enactments, but they all agree that the enactments are binding as law.

If, however, the innovation consists of an assault upon the authenticity and binding force of the Pentateuch, Judaism itself is assailed. There is nothing in the history of Judaism which would even give color to the suggestion that it denies the right of individual opinion and the liberty of conscience. Even to those who are openly at war with Judaism, sincerity is accorded, and it has never been claimed that a belief in Judaism is an essential of salvation. In fact, neither Judaism nor the Jews teach that faith in anything is an essential of salvation. This is purely a Christian doctrine.

But it is requisite to ascertain the true nature of any innovation in order to determine whether it fall within or without Judaism; whether it be a departure from Judaism or not. If it be ascertained to be a departure from Judaism, it does not necessarily follow that the departure is wrong, or that he who has brought it about will be doomed. But it does follow that the departure does not carry Judaism with it, even though it be brought about by Jews. If this were not so, then the departure from Judaism inaugurated by Christ and extended by his followers would have carried Judaism with it and rendered the preservation of the ancient faith illogical and unnecessary. The doctrines and practices of the Christian religion are upheld and followed and have been by untold millions of people. The same is true of the doctrines and practices enjoined by Mohammed, and it may be that Christianity or Mohamedanism is the true religion. It is undoubtedly true that both were derived from Judaism; and yet it cannot be

seriously contended by any thinking mind that either Mohammedanism or Christianity is Judaism. This is so because in each religion which proceeded from Judaism, a new law was formulated that expressly superseded, modified or abrogated the Pentateuch. Had Christianity or Mohammedanism consisted simply of an interpretation of the Pentateuch, it might be with reason contended in favor of each that it is the true Judaism. But no such claim is made.

To illustrate the distinction which I undertake to make let me briefly refer to the schisms in the Christian church. The Church of Rome, the Greek Church and the various Protestant denominations differ widely in their interpretations of both the old and the new Testaments, but they all agree that the arbiter between them in their differences is the Bible; hence, they may all with reason claim to be Christian churches. But if a denomination should arise, following the ethical parts of the Christian religion, but nevertheless denying the divinity of Christ and the binding force of his decrees, no man would be absurd enough to call it Christian. It is equally true that any man or denomination denying the binding force of the Pentateuch as containing the divine law is without the pale of Judaism.

In the light of the propositions already laid down, let us consider the so-called Jewish reform movement in America. For convenience we will assume that it has been in existence for half a century. The first and most striking feature in reference thereto is its want of system. It has been spasmodic, erratic, and altogether negative. It has never had a great leader. It has none now. No one has arisen as a reformer with a defined idea or policy around which gather earnest disciples and followers, but on the contrary the entire movement is chaotic, sensational and illogical. It cannot be tested as a whole because it has no unity. There is no cohesion among those who have projected and propelled it except that cohesion which arises from negation. Each so-called reformer has been a leader instead of a follower; each has been a law unto himself; each has denied any standard except that formulated by himself; each has denied the leadership of all others and has assumed it for himself. The so-called reform

movement in each congregation differs from that of all others, and even in a particular congregation the movement takes its complexion from the minister, who for the time being occupies the pulpit; and so it has come to pass repeatedly, when a minister has died or resigned his position in a congregation, that his successor has preached a so-called reform Judaism which did not consist with that which prevailed during the incumbency of his predecessor. The Judaism of no reform congregation therefore can be defined by reference to that of any other, and they resemble one another chiefly in the fact that they are all differentiated from so-called orthodox Judaism.

The bewilderment which necessarily arises from the fact that from each pulpit claiming to be Jewish a different Judaism is taught, suggests the necessity of testing these various and conflicting religions by reference to some standard. That standard must be true Judaism. All of the so-called reformers proclaim themselves as Jews and that their teachings are true Judaism. All claim kinship with all other Jews in religious matters. These claims are more or less disputed and the so-called reformers are denounced by a vast majority of contemporary Jews, as radical departers, not only from mere forms and practices, but from the essentials of Judaism. In many cases these denunciations are not confined to those who are termed orthodox Jews, but so-called reformers denounce other so-called reformers as having departed from the true faith.

To those who are wedded and obstinately cling to the Scriptures, to their literal interpretation and to all the customs and practices imposed by Rabbis, by interpretation or otherwise, any innovation is in conflict with Judaism.

There is, however, another class, and in it are embraced the most enlightened Jews, orthodox and reform, who, however willing in deference to changed conditions, to drop obsolete customs, rights and ceremonies, not enjoined in the Pentateuch, are yet unwilling to depart from the essentials of their ancient faith, and to them it becomes a matter of vast importance to have a standard by which to test the differences that exist between the

so-called orthodox and the so-called reformers and between and among the so-called reformers themselves.

What then is the common ground upon which all Jews can stand? As we have already seen in times past, when differences arose as to interpretations, or as to practices enjoined otherwise than in the Torah, the Torah itself was the arbiter. Is it still so? The laymen who have neither time, opportunity or inclination to study minutely the history and the development of the Jewish religion, and who by reason of their ignorance in respect of these matters are utterly confounded by the differences that exist among the ministers, have a right to know what is the common ground upon which all Jews can and must stand, and it is the duty of the Rabbis to answer the question that comes from the lips of every earnest and bewildered Jew. What is Judaism? What are its criteria? What are its characteristics? How is it differentiated from all other religions? What is it necessary to believe and to do in order to be a Jew religiously? And be it remembered when these questions are propounded, that the earnest seeker after information does not ask what shall *I* believe? What shall *I* do to be saved, what shall *I* believe and what shall *I* do to meet the favor of the Almighty, and what shall *I* believe in order to lead a pure life? But what is necessary to *believe,* and what is necessary to *do* to bring myself *within the defined limits of Judaism?*

As one of those who are so confused by the differences that have arisen, I venture to remark that the ethics of Christianity, Confucianism and even Buddhism, if followed, would result in a pure life, in justice and mercy to our fellow men, in the practice of all those virtues which elevate and ennoble mankind. But these ethics are common to all enlightened religions and of themselves do not constitute a religion. Each of the religions named is differentiated in one or more particulars from the others, and Judaism, if it be a religion, is likewise differentiated.

Wherein and how?

Again and again the demand goes forth from those who are ignorant to those who are learned: *What is Judaism?*

It would seem that so simple a question addressed to those

who have devoted their lives to a study of the Jewish religion, should meet with a prompt and explicit reply. But in this country, and from the so-called reform leaders, it is apparently impossible to extract an answer. Will the rank and file submit always to their silence?

In the Menorah Magazine for July, 1887, in behalf of thousands of Jews bewildered and confused as I was then and am now, I addressed an open letter to the Rabbis of America setting forth the difficulties under which I and those similarly situated were suffering, and earnestly, humbly and respectfully prayed for answers to certain questions contained in the letter. All the questions were subsidiary to and finally led up to the one controlling question—What is Judaism? Define it, tell us what it is.

In adverting now to that letter, I appreciate the fact that I may, with some show of justice be charged with indelicacy, and if the matter under discussion were of less moment I should refrain from calling attention to the communication. I am impressed, however, with the conviction that in writing it I was not writing for myself alone, but for a large class, and that when it was published it ceased to be mine and became the property of all those in a like situation with myself. This impression is strengthened by the reception which the letter received from the Jewish press in this country and abroad. I cannot here undertake to quote all, or even any great portion of what was said by the press about it. To acquit myself, however, of an apparent want of modesty, I will quote a few expressions to show that I cannot with reason claim a proprietary interest in the questions.

The Jewish Free Press of St. Louis, July 8, 1887, says:

"The American Jewish youth is waiting with bated breath for an answer to the questions propounded by Mr. Levi, and which are re-echoed from a hundred thousand young Jewish souls."

On July 22, 1887, the Jewish Spectator, of Memphis, was temporarily in charge of Mr. B. W. Hirsh, a brilliant lawyer. On that date a leader warmly commending my article and insisting that it be answered, appeared.

The American Hebrew of New York, July 8, 1887, after quoting my article in the Menorah, says:

"We have no doubt that Mr. Levi gives expression to the thoughts of thousands of sincere Israelites, and the answer should be given to him by those entrusted with the position of speaking in the name of Judaism. Though an individual propounds the questions, they are, in fact, the queries on the lips of the Jewish community. It is high time that the people should hear from the lips of their teachers "What Judaism is," and not as the custom has been "What Judaism is not." Should the appointed exponents of the Jewish religion fail to vouchsafe the coveted information, laymen may have to step forward and perform the teachers' task."

The Jewish Exponent of Philadelphia, on July 8, 1887, commenting on the article, says: "It is in effect a call upon the reform movement to define its position."

To an impartial observer, it would certainly appear that questions so simple and so earnest, insisted upon by so many who are entitled to be informed, should have been answered.

How, in fact, were they received, and how answered by those whose duty it is to reply?

In the September Menorah, 1887, Rev. Dr. L. Kleeberg, of New Haven, Conn., undertaking to answer the questions, says in effect: "The ethical element of the Bible must be considered as the real essence of Judaism." Then follow passages from the Scripture as to the duty of man, enjoining conduct required by every religion of note, such as Christianity, Mohammedanism, etc. The ethical teachings upon which Dr. Kleeberg insists are enjoined in the XV Psalm, and these ethical teachings, or this "ethical element" to use his own language, is his answer as to what is the real essence of Judaism. The learned Doctor seems to have overlooked the fact that the question is not, "What is the real essence of Judaism?" but "What is Judaism?" and he seems to have entirely overlooked the fact that all religions teach the particular ethical doctrines to which he has called attention. The pertinent query arises: If a man lives as enjoined in the XV Psalm, shall we *ipso facto* call him a Jew, a Christian, a Mohammedan, or what?

In the same magazine for October, 1887, the Rev. Dr. B. Fel-

senthal, of Chicago, prints his answer in German. In the November number of the same magazine the same reply appears in English. I quote from the English version wherein he says: "Judaism as a religion, is a power which sanctifies our life, and which rests upon the fundamental principle of the acknowledgment of a sole and individual primitive power that conditions and fosters morality; a power in life which germinated and developed itself and progressed in the midst of Israel and the Jews. Judaism is furthermore a religion which has established for itself such customs, laws, institutions and ceremonies which were made necessary by and fitted to the respective local and timely circumstances and conditions of life among the Jews."

Again he says:

"Let us clearly understand it that we recognize and have to consider as a Jew, anyone who says of himself that he is a Jew, who declares that he finds himself in spiritual connection with Judaism, who maintains that his whole mental life roots within the soil of Judaism."

It is difficult to criticise such a nebulous answer. If it means anything, it means that he is a Jew who claims to be a Jew. This certainly does not resolve any doubts, or offer any standard by which to test the claims of conflicting religious schemes all claiming to be Jewish.

On August 15, 1887, in the Jewish Spectator, published at Memphis, Tenn., the Rev. Dr. M. Samfield, the editor, says:

"We may safely predict that no replies will come forth to the interrogatories published in the Menorah, not because they are questions answerless and irrefutable, but simply because to furnish Mr. Leo N. Levi with all the information he desires in response to the thirty questions, would involve the publication of about fifteen octavo volumes, printed in minion type. We hope that no American Rabbi will undertake the gigantic task."

Judaism is assuredly a most complex religion if it cannot be defined inside of the limits named by him.

The Rev. Dr. Voorsanger, in the Jewish Times, of San Francisco, published Aug. 12, 1887, undertakes to reply, but instead writes a most eloquent sermon showing how a man can live a

pure and virtuous life. This sermon might have been written or preached by any Christian minister, any follower of Mohammed, Buddha or Confucius. It nowhere undertakes to give a definition, but devotes itself to the proposition that a man may live a pure life and be virtuous without any theology or definitions. This may be true, although I think the contrary is easily shown. But, true or not, it is no answer to the questions propounded.

Rev. H. M. Bien, of Vicksburg, undertook to answer in six sermons which are now to be had in book form, but the value of his answer is destroyed by the fact that it does not undertake to define Judaism, but does undetrake to define the religious tenets of the author. He adopts the XIX Psalm, as furnishing the correct guide for love towards God, and duty towards men, and discourses with more or less eloquence upon his theme. But again it may be said that he has not given any answer to the query propounded.

Rev. Dr. Isaac M. Wise, the Nestor among the American Reform Rabbis, in the Menorah for October, 1887, says:

"And I will betroth thee unto me forever; yea, I will betroth thee unto me in righteousness and justice, and in loving kindness, and in mercy; and thou shalt know thy God."—Hosea 11-22."

"This formula contains a full and comprehensive definition of Judaism what it is *per se,* in theory, and in practice, what it is, was and forever will be, what are its criteria, its characteristics, by which it is distinguished from all other creeds and systems.

"Judaism is the religion of the three-fold covenant between God and Man, God and Israel as recorded and preserved in the Torah, written by Moses in the book of the Covenant (Exodus XXIV 1-8, 2 Kings XXII, 8-10 XXIII-24) expounded and reduced to practice at different times by Moses, the prophets, sages, and lawfully constituted bodies of Israel."

Many other efforts more or less ambitious, were made to furnish answers to the questions. None except those that I have mentioned need be dignified by any reference to them here. Suffice that they were less meritorious and further from answering the questions or any one of them than those to which I have referred. In passing I think it but just to say in respect of Dr.

Wise that while his answer may not be sufficiently comprehensive, at least it has the merit of being a definition. It undertakes to assign Judaism to its proximate genus and to differentiate it from all other religions by a mention of its specific differences. Whether it be sufficient and accurate or not, I am unable to determine. If it be accurate, if it be comprehensive, it ought to gain for itself the consensus of all other Rabbis, whether reform or orthodox. If it be inaccurate it should be criticised by other Rabbis.

It is manifest that with the single exception of Dr. Wise, none of those whose replies have come to my attention have undertaken to give a definition of Judaism. Many have contended that it cannot be defined. If so there must be reason for it, and we are entitled to know the reason. When, however, such authority as Dr. Wise and others undertake to define it and when we find that lexicographers, philosophers, students and scientific men do define it, to the comprehension of all men, we cannot be expected to accede to the proposition that Judaism is incapable of definition. Shall it not then be defined for us, by those who avowedly preach and expound it? Shall we not demand such a definition, and when the statements are made in response to our demand, how shall we test them?

Prof. C. P. Tiele, of the University of Leyden, in his article on Religion, published in the Encyclopedia Brittannica, says: "Not only has every religion as a whole and every religious group, to be compared with others, that we may know in what particular qualities it agrees with or differs from them, and that we may determine its special characteristics, but, before this can be done, comparative study on a much larger scale must precede. Every religion has two prominent constituent elements, the one theoretical, the other practical, religious ideas and religious acts. The ideas may be vague conceptions, concrete myths, precise dogmas, either handed over by tradition or recorded in sacred books combined or not into systems of mythology and dogmatics, summarized or not in a creed or symbol, but there is no living religion without something like a doctrine. On the other hand a doctrine, however elaborate, does not constitute a religion. Scarcely less than by its leading ideas, a religion is characterized

by its rites and institutions, including in the higher phases of development, moral precepts in the higher phases, ethical principles. It happens but very seldom, if ever, that these two elements balance each other. In different religions they are commonly found in very different proportions, some faiths being pre-eminently doctrinal or dogmatic, others pre-eminently ritualistic or ethical, but where one of them is wanting entirely, religion no longer exists. Not that dogma and ritual are religion; they are only its necessary manifestations, the embodiment of what must be considered as its very life and essence, of that which as an inner conviction must be distinguished from a doctrine or creed—a belief."

All of the standard dictionaries define religion as, "The recognition of God, as an object of worship, love and obedience." The Imperial Dictionary further defines it as, "The feeling of reverence which men entertain towards a supreme being, or any order of beings conceived by them as demanding reverence from the possession of superhuman control over the destiny of man or the power of nature."

As explanatory of the latter definition, the Imperial Dictionary quotes as follows from Prof. Max Muller: "It may be easily perceived that religion means at least two very different things. When we speak of the Jewish or Christian religion or the Hindu, we mean a body of doctrines handed down by tradition or in canonical books and containing all that constitutes the faith of Jew, Christian, or Hindu. Using religion in that sense we might say, that a man has changed his religion, that is that he has adopted the Christian instead of the Brahamanical body of religious doctrines, just as a man may learn to speak English instead of Hindustani.

But religion is also used in a different sense. As there is a faculty of speech, independent of all historical forms of language, so we may speak of a faculty of faith in man independent of all historical religions. If we say that it is religion which distinguishes man from the animal, we do not mean the Christian or the Jewish religion only. We do not mean any special religion, but we mean a mental faculty; that faculty which independent of, nay, in spite of sense or reason, enables man to apprehend the In-

finite under different names, and in varying disguises. Without that faculty no religion, not even the lowest worship of idols and fetishes would be possible; and if we will listen attentively, we can hear in all religions a groaning of the spirit, a struggle to conceive the inconceivable, to utter the unutterable, a longing after the Infinite, a love of God."

Here we perceive a distinction which has been lost sight of almost altogether in the answers of the Rabbis heretofore adverted to.

Judaism is defined in all of the standard dictionaries as "the religious doctrine and rites of the Jews, as enjoined in the laws of Moses." I do not quote this definition as being absolutely correct, but merely for the purpose of showing that Judaism is susceptible of definition, and that its definition has been undertaken by lexicographers, whose efforts in that direction, whether successful or not, are at least comprehensible, and if not correct, may be made so. Those who are in touch with Judaism and whose vocation it is to study it, may certainly enlarge or correct the definition as given in the dictionaries, if that definition requires enlargement or qualification.

There is no religion, and can be none, that does not embrace both doctrines and rites. In every religion there must be contained a doctrine, a belief, a command, as well as a mode of life. The acceptance of such doctrines and beliefs, obedience to such commands and conformity with such mode of life, are the requirements of the particular religion, and those who do not recognize such requirements, place themselves beyond the pale of the religion. And this is true, without reference to the virtue or sinfulness of the particular individual. History is full of instances of virtuous practices by free-thinkers, skeptics and even atheists. Pure and noble men have existed in all religions, and there is doubtless some community of spirit among all virtuous men. But it would be absurd to contend because there is much in common among all good men, that all good men are therefore Christians, Buddhists, Jews or Mohammedans. All enlightened religions have a common goal, each seeking to reach it by different roads or methods. True tolerance recognizes this, and it is in no wise

impaired by the claim on the part of each particular religion, that its road and its methods are superior to all others.

The great age, the glorious history, the magnificent achievements and the enduring quality of Judaism must certainly commend it to the earnest attention of every member of the Jewish race. It should be approached by him, with what Mr. Gladstone calls "reverential awe." Its criteria, characteristics and essentials should be most earnestly considered, and if found true, as earnestly observed. Those who are charged, or have charged themselves with studying and expounding Judaism, to say the least, place themselves in a ridiculous attitude if they decline to make the understanding of this ancient faith an easy matter to all men. It should be demanded by every Jew, that his minister should explain to him, in clear and explicit terms, what is the religion of his forefathers and what are its essentials.

I anticipate that what I have said will be criticised by those claiming to have a catholic spirit. It will be contended that I am seeking to build a wall around Judaism so as to segregate it from all other faiths and thus engender a spirit of intolerance. It will be asked, as has already been asked, what matter it whether we hold to a certain faith or practice certain ceremonies, so long as we lead a pure and virtuous life. Such a question cannot well be disregarded, for if it be unimportant to hold to any particular religion, or to practice any particular rites and ceremonies, then the complaint, which is the basis of this discussion, is itself without foundation. I hold that it is of the last importance that a man should follow a particular religion in order to lead a virtuous life, and when I say "man" I do not mean a particular man or a particular class of men, but I mean man in general.

While the child is of tender years, a command from the parent is susceptible of enforcement, either through love or fear on the part of the child for the parent. But there comes a time in the life of the child when its mind expands, and when its reason demands an explanation of the mandates which it is called upon to obey. If the father shall tell the child that he must not lie or steal or commit violence, the child will ask why? The birds and beasts that the child sees about him practice deception, commit theft, and

visit violence upon other birds and beasts. Why then should the child abstain from these things, which it has set before it by example every day of its life? The parent will promptly respond that the child must abstain, because lying, stealing and violence are wrong. The child will then ask why is it wrong? Shall the parent content the inquiring mind by saying that it is wrong, because I, the parent, have so decreed? Surely not. Will he undertake to find a basis in reason for the proposition that lying, stealing and killing are wrong? Has anyone ever been able to demonstrate, without reference to some revealed law, that man commits a sin when he lies, steals or kills?

I am not unmindful of the argument that every man possesses certain rights, and that whoever invades those rights commits a wrong; that every man has a right of life, liberty, property and reputation, and that whoever invades these rights commits a wrong. But if these propositons are to be accepted as self-evident (and unless they be self-evident they cannot be accepted), are they not equally applicable to every species of the animal kingdom, as well as to man? Does it not follow that lying, stealing and violence on the part of the lion and tiger or any other animal involve the commission of sin?

Such considerations must drive the parent at last to a choice between teaching morality as a matter of expediency only, or as obedience to the divine law. If he elects to teach morality as divinely ordained, he must be able to explain to the child when, where and under what circumstances the law was given, and why it is obligatory. This involves the teachings not only of religion in its general aspect, but involves the teaching of a particular religion.

I apprehend, however, that it requires no great argument to impress upon every Jew the importance of teaching Judaism to his children. There is great need, however, of impressing upon the Jews the importance of teaching true Judaism to their children. It is a grave breach of faith to a child to teach it a religion which the teacher does not believe to be true. For sooner or later the child will discover what the teacher regards as spurious, and will indiscriminately set aside the entire lesson because of that

therein contained which is discredited by the teacher. But upon higher grounds than even the welfare of the child should every man avoid teaching what he believes to be false. No teacher of religion, whatever be its form, can justify falsehood and hypocrisy upon any ground whatsoever, any more than can any man justify lying or any other form of wrong-doing. Doing evil that good may come of it is a pernicious doctrine that can find no appropriate place in any religious scheme, nor in the life of any virtuous man. We cannot escape the obligation to teach a religion to our children, nor the obligation to see that those charged with the task of teaching are sincere in their work. It becomes, therefore, for this reason alone, if for no other, of the utmost importance that the teachers of the particular religion shall be sincere in their teachings, and shall be in accord as to the essentials of the religion they teach. For this reason, among others, the Jewish laymen should persist in their demand that the Rabbis shall define Judaism, *and shall stand by it or leave it.*

I have already shown that the so-called reform Rabbis in the United States are not generally in accord, and they are unable or unwilling to define Judaism and to indicate the common ground upon which they all stand, however great their differences may be upon minor matters. In many instances they have suffered themselves to become intoxicated by the iconoclastic and revolutionary spirit of the age. They have yielded themselves to the superficial skepticism of the present era, which is, after all, but a repetition of the same manifestation at different periods of the world's history. Whenever man has made great progress in the subjugation of nature to his own wants, he has set up his own reason, his own intellect as an object of worship. The human understanding is set up by a process of deification to be worshipped by itself. It undertakes to test every propositon by its own powers, and whatever it is not able to grasp, conceive or comprehend, it rejects as necessarily untrue.

Even in the time of that great philosopher, Montaigne, it was the case, and of it he says:

"'Tis a very great presumption to slight and condemn all things for false that do not appear to us likely to be true; which is

the ordinary vice of such as fancy themselves wiser than their neighbors. * * * Reason has instructed me that resolutely to condemn anything for false and impossible is to circumscribe and limit the will of God and the power of nature within the bounds of my own capacity, than which no folly can be greater. If we give the names of monster and miracle to everything our reason cannot comprehend, how many such are continually presented before our eyes? Let us but consider through what clouds, as it were, groping through what darkness, our teachers lead us to the knowledge of most of the things which we apply our studies to, and we shall find that it is rather custom than knowledge that takes away the wonder and renders them easy and familiar to us, and that if those things were now newly presented to us we should think them as strange and incredible if not more so than any others."

"He that had never seen a river imagined the first he met with to be a sea; and the greatest things that have fallen within our knowledge we conclude the extremes that nature makes of the kind. 'Things grow familiar to men's minds by being often seen, so that they neither admire nor are inquisitive into things they daily see, (Cicero). The novelty rather than the greatness of things tempts us to inquire into their causes. But we are to judge with more reverence and with greater acknowledgment of our own ignorance and infirmity of the infinite power of nature. How many unlikely things are there testified by people of very good repute which, if we cannot persuade ourselves absolutely to believe, we ought at least to leave them in suspense, for to condemn them as impossible is by a Temerarious presumption to pretend to know the utmost bounds of possibility."

The innovations which find their genesis in such a mental process as is here condemned are necessarily diverse and without cohesion, because the mental processes differ in the ratio of the minds in which they occur. And when to this erratic mental process is added an abnormal thirst for novelty, it is readily conceivable how great and how numerous must be the consequent errors.

Lord Bacon in his essay on Innovations justly appreciates and gives warning against this tendency in the following words:

"Beware that it be the reformation that draweth on the change and not the desire for change that pretendeth the reformation; and lastly that the novelty though it be not rejected yet be held for a suspect."

It would be easy to show how the greatest minds of every age have reached the conclusion that there can be no greater folly than to limit one's faith to facts that the mind can comprehend and fully explain. It would be equally easy to demonstrate by authority that the understanding or reason cannot safely be relied upon as a guide to conduct. If reason is set up as an object of worship or even as a guide to conduct, it should possess the quality of constancy, it should operate uniformly in all men and in all men possessed of the same data it should reach the same conclusion. But, on the contrary, nothing is so inconsistent as reason. It not only operates differently in different men, in different eras, but it operates differently in the same man at different times. If truth or the conception of it is to depend upon the constant changes in the operations of the human intellect, it is unworthy of man's aspirations. But the truth exists whether men apprehend it or not, and it cannot be measured by man's capacity to apprehend it.

Mr. Edison, one of the foremost, if not the foremost man of his time, one who has done more to distinguish this age than any other; one who has mastered more mysteries of nature than any other man of his time, has truly observed that: "We don't know a millionth part of one per cent about anything." Again he has said: "I find that the conceit of man is in the inverse ratio to the square of his knowledge." This is but stating in a different way a proposition accepted of all wise men that the greater our learning, and the greater our wisdom, the more we appreciate how little we know, and how much is beyond the capacity of man to know. Nothing could so clearly demonstrate the inconsistency and the impotence of reason as the subject of this discussion. Men who have refused and do refuse to believe those things which their reason cannot comprehend or explain, find themselves totally unable by resort to their reason and understanding, to explain so simple and historical a fact as the essential nature of Judaism.

It is a common error to claim that a want of faith is peculiar to men of great learning and wisdom, and that the enlightenment of this age is responsible for the decadence of faith. That this is an error is easily shown. Faith is no easier or harder now than it was aforetime. The discoveries of this age render it no more difficult to believe the Bible than in times gone by. The ethical qualities of the Bible are not impaired in the least by any discoveries of science in this or any other age, and as to the narrative portion of the Scriptures scientific discoveries have not augmented the difficulties over what they were two thousand years ago. It was as difficult for a human mind to comprehend and believe the narrative portions of the Bible twenty centuries ago as it is now. Skepticism has always arisen from the deification of the human intellect by superficial thinkers who do not realize that with the Infinite the most exalted mind compares no better than the lowest. It is true that increase of knowledge involved the decrease of superstition and in the decadence of superstition faith necessarily suffered. Superstition bears the same relation to faith that alchemy does to chemistry. It is doubtless true that chemistry has suffered by reason of its relation to alchemy, but it would be the height of folly to entirely set aside and decry chemistry, because it was once aligned with the spurious doctrines of a false science. True wisdom dictates that we should separate the wheat from the chaff, that we should rid ourselves of the false and safeguard the true. This distinction which wisdom demands has not been observed by many so-called reform Rabbis in the United States. With them there has been no preservative or constructive process. It is not to be gainsaid that even those who have departed radically from the traditional faith of their fathers have preached virtue and right conduct. But upon what basis? They have not derived it from God, nor from His law, but from their own minds. They have based it upon utility, man's nature, man's natural rights, duties, etc., leaving it at last without any warmth or vitality which stir the emotions and influence the heart. The religion which they have taught is like an artificial flower which may deceive the eye for a time, but when closely inspected excites the keenest disappointment.

There can be no religion without faith, and that faith cannot be limited by man's power of comprehension. Even when it involves something beyond the comprehension of the intellect it is not repugnant to reason, for it is altogether reasonable that revelation and miracles should have occurred for the ends for which they did occur. To deny that they could have occurred is to deny the omnipotence of the Creator and to limit his power to those achievements that man can understand.

Moreover, the extraordinary occurrences that men reject on the ground of reason were in no sense more wonderful than those which we see evey day and unhesitatingly accept. They differ from the phenomena that are daily apparent only in their rarity. The faith that is made to accommodate itself to the powers of comprehension in the individual begins and ends nowhere, for, as has been shown, the power of comprehension is constantly changing and necessarily the faith must change with it. The faith that is based on reason alone, as reason is defined by the so-called reformers, is in the highest sense unreasonable, for it has no stability and cannot be imparted to others. No man can teach a faith that has such narrow limitations, neither can he inspire faith in his reason, for to inspire faith in his reason he must have reason in his faith.

The Jews in America cannot with safety permit the demoralization which exists in their synagogues to continue. If they desire to preserve their ancient religion and impart it to their children, they must insist that their spiritual leaders shall define that religion, adhere to it themselves, and teach it to the congregants. Such a demand made by the members of each congregation upon their respective ministers will, doubtless, result in much temporary demoralization, acrimony and strife. Many of those who are now posing as Jewish Rabbis will doubtless find that they must recede from some of the positions they have held, or must separate themselves from Judaism. But when that is accomplished we will no longer see the sacred doctrines of Judaism assailed from Jewish pulpits to Jewish hearers by so-called Jewish Rabbis. Time and again have the priests among the Jews taught false doctrines; time and again they have been compelled

to recant or depart from the Jewish fold. When Ezra came he found the law being violated by the priests, and disregarded by the people, and with the aid of Nehemiah, he drove out the false priests and led the people back to an observance of the law. History repeats itself and in this country there will arise some one who, animated with the spirit that governed the life of Ezra, will point out to the people wherein they are disregarding the law, and by inspiring the people with love and obedience for the law, will cause them to scourge from the pulpits the false priests who are scandalizing the ancient faith. The people are ripe for the coming of such a leader. They have come to distrust their Rabbis. They have come to regard with indifference the doctrines which are preached from the pulpit. They find themselves unable to teach morality to their children except upon grounds of expediency. They find in short that they have departed from their ancient bearings, and are drifting without rudder or compass; they are beginning to look coldly upon Rabbis who recommend themselves almost exclusively by their skill in oratory, by their grace of diction, by their capacity to entertain, but who are wanting in the true elements of the ideal Rabbi. The ideal Rabbi, for whose coming they are longing, will be a man imbued with a perfect faith in God's law as written in Torah; he will study it with a broad and liberal mind, seeking always to comprehend the will of the Creator to the end that he may observe it; he will be imbued with this faith and filled with this understanding, devoting himself to teaching and practicing the ancient religion, not as a mere matter of form, but as a vital and forceful agency to accomplish the true development of man's highest nature. To him eloquence will consist in deeds, not words; to him entertainment will only be an incident to instruction; to him theology only an aid to piety; to him ceremonies will be divinely ordered means to a divinely ordered end; to him the human intellect will be infinitely small compared with the infinite mind of God; to him man will be most clearly distinguished from the animal in that he has received by revelation the will of God. Such a man believing, following, teaching and practicing the doctrine, the rites and the ceremonies of Judaism, will stand forth before the eyes of the

Jews as a leader to be followed. Around him will be gathered disciples eager to learn and eager to follow, and the multitude will take from his lips, and from the lips of his disciples, the truths which have been hidden from them so long. And as in the days of Ezra, after many years of indifference, the people will gather in the temples to pray with a truly worshipful spirit. It is only then that the doubts, the vexations, the groanings of spirit which now so commonly manifest themselves among the people will disappear, then will the people rest their doubts, their difficulties and their troubles upon the altar of their faith, accepting whatever betides as the will of their Creator. With Edwin Booth, each man will then consider "That life is a great big spelling book, and on every page we turn the words grow harder to understand the meaning of, but there is a meaning, and when the last leaf flops over we will know the whole lesson by heart."

WHAT SHALL BECOME OF THE JEWS.

One of the most interesting, important and unsettled problems which this century will hand over for solution to the next, is known as the Jewish question.

Occasionally we hear protests, more or less vigorous, against the existence of such a question and the discussion thereof is decried as unwarranted by the conditions that obtain. More frequently we observe a disposition to suppress discussion by those who regard the question as the Ancient Sicilians did the lake of Kamarina. But as a rule the matter is neither ignored nor avoided. Students, scholars, philosophers and statesmen of all classes and creeds have taken it up with more or less earnestness and have treated it from various standpoints and in various moods.

So long as the question remains unsettled it may safely be assumed that those who are addressing themselves to its consideration have found no common ground from which to study it. The wide differences that exist and the controversies that rage over great problems, do not result so much from varying processes of thought, as from separate points of view. Whenever there is a consensus as to the proper point of view the solution is as prompt and easy as the reading of a puzzle picture when the clue is found.

That the problem is yet unsettled is a statement requiring no argument or testimony for its support. That it is interesting is attested by the fact that in the periodicals and newspapers of every civilized counry it is discussed by thinkers to satisfy a demand on the part of countless readers. That it is important is equally well evidenced. The life purpose of such a man as Pobiedonotseff in Russia, as Stoecker or Ahlwardt in Germany and of Drumont in France and the turmoil each has produced or augmented prove how deep the question reaches and how far it extends.

What is the problem, and how shall we approach it to arrive at a correct solution?

This is a thinking, generalizing, classifying and regulating era. Education has spread far and wide. History has been studied to find a philosophy of causation in the events which history chronicles. Existing civilization is traced back to its very roots, nay to the seed from which germinated root, stem, flower and fruit. Influences that have operated in the development of that civilization or which have impeded it, those which have made the world better or worse, have been scrutinized and classified and according to the judgment of the particular thinker and student commended for culture or condemned to destruction.

In the course of this investigation the Jew has not been overlooked. Indeed he has obtruded himself not a little on others besides thinkers and students. He is everywhere in evidence. He sells vodki, practices usury, trades and toils in Russia; he matches his cunning against Moslem and Greek in Turkey; he fights for existence and endures martyrdom in the Balkan provinces; he crowds the professions, the arts, the market place, the bourse and the army of France, England, Austria and Germany; he has invaded every calling in America and everywhere he is seen and what is more to the point, he is felt. He is not sufficiently numerous or powerful to be in anybody's way, but whenever a prize is hung up for superiority in anything, he enters the list against the world and somehow and somewhere he wins it. He has contended against odds and numbers, against public prejudice and governmental regulations, but he has uniformly triumphed in the end by virtue of that inflexible law which bestows the palm of success to him who grasps and maintains it.

He runs throughout the entire length of history as a thin but well defined line touched by the high lights of great events at almost every point. Albeit an integral part of the situation in which he takes his place, with a nation of his own and scattered from his race-fellows he has never so far departed from inherited doctrines, rites, customs and habits as to lose his individuality as a Jew. He forms what has happily been called a Peculiar People.

The Jews have not materially increased or diminished in number for two thousand years. They have made no proselytes to their religion and have not as a people yielded that religion to persuasion, argument or force. They have imbibed the arts, the literature and the civilization of successive generations, but have abstained very generally from intermixture of blood and have clung with unrivaled tenacity to the traditional faith, customs and habits of their ancestors. They have infused their blood into that of other peoples, but have taken but little of other peoples into their own. The natural increase in their numbers has made up for the losses by defections and as those who wandered away were of the weakest among them, those who remained steadfast retained and transmitted a vigor not only unimpaired, but constantly improving. When it is remembered that this constant betterment has proceeded from an initial point immeasurably in advance of any competition, it is not difficult to understand why the Jews under anything like equal conditions win the prizes of success. That they do win them is a fact asserted and admitted by their friends and their foes. That they exist as a peculiar people is agreed by all; that they will not voluntarily surrender their identity and individuality is not disputed.

They are here as they have been for centuries about seven million strong scattered among a civilized population almost an hundred times greater, invading every field that is open to them and so uniformly successful in achievements that are of possible attainment as to excite wonder, admiration, envy and hatred.

And so the great majority stops and studies and thinks and asks what shall we do with the Jew? And the Jew noticing the clamor which he has provoked asks, what shall I do with myself? These questions are easily condensed into one, what shall become of the Jew? Shall he be regarded as a distinct substance in the social and governmental body? Shall he be treated as a cancerous growth to be removed by the knife? Shall he be permitted to remain by tolerance as a foreign substance in the body which when encisted ceases to be lethal? Shall he be wholly assimilated or shall he be regarded as an integral and proper, if not necessary part of the entire structure, performing functions

natural to him and profitable to all, just as the stomach, brains or heart of the human body?

But let us drop metaphors. Shall the Jew be exterminated? Shall he be merely tolerated or shall he be accorded recognition as possessing full rights along with the highest and best factors of governmental and social progress?

The general question, what shall become of the Jew, thus elaborated presents a problem which the twentieth century will have to solve.

The subject has not yet been sufficiently considered to be entirely clear, but while it may be too soon to announce the proper solution, it is high time to point out some prominent and common errors that obtain among those who are addressing themselves to the problem. The initial stage in every public problem is one of partisanship. It is only after the earnestness of partisans has attracted the interest of the entire public that impartial minds are enlisted. Thus far the Jewish question has been discussed as a rule by those who either loved or hated the Jews with great earnestness and even passion. The one side has seen nothing in the Jews to condemn; the other could find nothing to admire. Each is more or less sincere, and each equally wide of the truth.

If it were possible to organize a commission of thoroughly capable and impartial minds to study the Jewish Question from a standpoint unaffected by bias in favor of or prejudice against the Jew, and having in view solely the good of society at large, it is safe to predict that the result of their studies would be startling at once to the Jews and the general public.

One of the first conclusions that such a commission would necessarily arrive at would be that the problem is in no sense local and herein would be condemned the point of view of the great Jew haters in Russia, Germany and France. There is no evidence whatsoever to indicate a desire on the part of Pobiedonotseff in Russia, or of Ahlwardt or Stoecker in Germany, or Drumont in France to improve the Jews or in any wise to make them better members of society. On the contrary, these enemies of the "peculiar people" are addressing themselves with remarkable vigor and virulence to driving the Jews from their respective

countries. To each of them the only acceptable solution of the problem as they see it, is to rid their countries of the detested race. It remained for an American statesman to point out in a single sentence the error, if not the sinfulness of such a contracted view. In a celebrated message to Congress, President Harrison briefly, but tersely, indicated that the banishment of the Jews from Russia was a matter in which all nations were concerned, because when the Czar of Russia ordered the Jews to step out of Russia he in effect bade them step into some other country.

If the presence of Jews in any country produces a disturbance resulting in a national disease, it is not only unjust but unwise for the nation so affected to rid itself of its trouble by imposing it upon some other country. To do so would provoke retaliation by which the trouble would be increased rather than diminished.

Moreover, the remedy is as ineffectual as those prescribed by Dr. Sangrado. For it will be found that the patient, rather than the disease, will succumb to the drastic remedies employed.

Considering their wide dissemination, their extended influence, their tenacity and endurance, their existence and their future destiny, the Jews must be regarded as presenting a world problem rather than a question affecting only particular countries. Neither is the problem to be solved by collecting all the Jews in one country and forming them into a nation. The movement projected in this direction during the past few years will certainly take an impotrant place in the history of our times. It possesses a poetic charm and a sentimental attractiveness that will win for it friends among those who have only kindly feelings towards the Jews, and the enemies of the Jews would hail its success for obvious reasons.

But a colonization scheme, however well planned and ably conducted, cannot hope for success without colonists thoroughly in sympathy with the movement. For the present at least it may be safely assumed that the Jews as a rule are unwilling to enter into this project and those who are desirous of embracing it belong to a class which has everything to gain and nothing to lose by a change. Those of the race who have established a

domicile in countries where they enjoy some measure of liberty, are unwilling to become pioneers in a movement that must lead them to untold discomforts, privations and perils. Perhaps in the course of time the Holy land will again be peopled by the Jews, who may erect a government of their own. But even if this result be attained, there will nevertheless be distributed throughout the length and breadth of the civilized world so large a representation of the Jewish people as to continue the problem as it now exists, unless it be settled sooner under conditions of which the Jews themselves form a part.

The impartial commission which I have already mentioned would but reflect the views of all fair-minded men in condemning those who are avowedly or unconsciously governed by prejudice against the Jews. There is no safety in following the views of one whose judgment is clouded by prejudice and passion. Men of the highest talent are subject to the infirmity of passion and acting under this influence employ their natural gifts in the production of brilliant effusions against those who have excited their antagonism.

A partisanship begotten of and nurtured by hate is always unwholesome for him who exhibits it, for those towards whom it is exhibited, and above all for the society in which it finds a place. Such a partisanship should be frowned down by all those having in view the advancement of civilization, and indeed in the long run it is not only frowned down, but is put down.

Another great error commonly made not only by those who are antagonistic to the Jews, but by those who are disposed to be fair and friendly towa d them, consists in this, that the Jews being recognized as a peculiar people are treated in their entirety as being foreign to the body politic in which they dwell. By such thinkers they are considered altogether objectively. In the minds of those taking this view, the Jews as a class are ranged upon one side, the balance of the world on the other and the reciprocal rights and wrongs of the two sides are weighed, to the end that the differences, if any, which exist between them may be properly adjusted. If the Jews constituted a nation and had a government of their own, they might be regarded in this light, but

when it is reflected that they are scattered throughout the world, domiciled in different countries, where they accept the burdens and enjoy the privileges of citizenship, it will be readily seen that such a consideration of the problem is illogical and unjust.

The Jew of France is if anything more intensely French than Jewish. The Jew of Germany is as much imbued with the patriotic ideas that have made the German Empire possible as any subject who yielded his blood to form the cement of the imperial fabric. And even in Russia, where the Jew has had so little to kindle his patriotism, so intense is his love for Russia that he weeps at the very thought of being driven from her borders, even when he is offered an asylum in countries where he will be subject to no restrictions on account of his race or religion.

The Jew is not only to be regarded as a Jew but as a citizen. He is not an alien, but a compatriot. He is not a foreigner, but a native. He is not an enemy, but an ally. He is a part and parcel of the social organization amidst which he finds himself and he must be so considered. If he stood apart in all things from the civilization in which he dwells society might well inquire into the propriety of suffering him to affect that civilization. But he is already a part of it. He has helped to build it up, he has in a large degree shaped its career, he remains to affect its future course, and when society addresses itself to the consideration of the Jew, it must regard him as an integral factor of itself, so interwoven with the general fabric that anything which affects him must more or less directly affect all.

It is a gross error, and a most unjust one, to consider the Jews as a separate and distinct people in respect of any matter that is not distinctly or peculiarly Jewish. In the pursuit of any calling, trade or profession, pursued along legitimate lines there is no wisdom or justice in regarding the Jew in a different light from that which is shed upon any other member of society. It can be of no concern to the consumer that the producer, manufacturer, or vendor of an article consumed is a Jew, Mohammedan or Christian, a Frenchman, German or American. The prime consideration, if not the only one, is the price of the article as compared with

others of like character and quality. So, too, it can make no difference in the arts, what is the religion or race of the artist, nor in the sciences, nor the professions. The music which delights an audience, is neither better nor worse for having been produced by musicians not of the same race or religion with the audience.

And if it be contended, as it is in Germany and France, that the Jews forming a small minority of the national population practicly monopolize certain branches of learning and art and commerce, that fact is rather to be urged in their favor than against them, unless it can be shown that this monopoly results from methods peculiar to this people and in themselves illegitimate and hurtful.

In their domestic life the Jews should also be free of officious intermeddling, unless the character of that domestic life is injurious to the public at large. The same may be said of their religion and the practice thereof.

In short, the Jew should be treated as any other member of society, as possessing full liberty to seek happiness along lines of his own selection without any restrictions, except those that are imposed for the general welfare of society. This principle so manifestly correct is undisputed even by those most violent in their denunciation of the Jews, but they curiously contend that since the Jews are in a hopeless minority, the welfare of society is impaired by the success of the Jews. It is argued that when they monopolize positions of vantage in science and art, in the trades and the market places, they exclude others representing the great majority from those positions. If this argument were not persisted in with so much force and received with so much favor it would scarcely merit attention. A few questions addressed to those who offer it would certainly confound them and utterly destroy the effect of the views they advance.

Will it be seriously contended that if the Rothchilds had never lived, there would have arisen Christian financiers of like eminence? That but for Moses Mendelsohn and Spinoza, there would have been two great Christian luminaries in the philosophic world to fill the places occupied by them? That if there had been no Heine, there would have arisen in Germany a poet, who

could have blended as he alone has done, the Hebraic and Hellenic spirit? That but for D'Israeli, there would have been an English statesman not of Jewish blood to create British unity and symbolize it with an imperial crown? That Montefiore and Baron de Hirsch have usurped and monopolized the field of philanthropy and that consequently there is no room for good works on the part of other people? To such questions but one answer is offered, to-wit: That Jewish success, which excludes all rivalry is due to certain methods of the Jews that cannot be practiced by their competitors. If this be true, it is proper to inquire what those methods are, and if they are illegitimate, they should be suppressed. And certainly society, so largely outnumbering the Jews, can have no difficulty in putting down illegitimate practices indulged in by a minority to the detriment of society.

If, on the other hand, those methods are found to be legitimate in themselves and end in such magnificent results, they should be emulated and followed rather than condemned and suppressed, otherwise society at large will practice the supreme folly of which the Greeks were guilty when they ostracized their noblest citizen, because they were tired of hearing him called just. Civilization advances upward not only by stepping on its failures, but by clinging to its successes. It advances by pulling itself upwards towards those who are in the front, rather than by dragging the leaders back to the common herd.

The Jewish Question is not to be solved by tolerance. There are thousands of well meaning people who take to themselves great credit for exhibiting a spirit of tolerance towards the Jews.

Tolerance presupposes inferiority on the part of those towards whom it is exhibited and superiority on the part of those extending it. In religious matters it is manifestly a proper spirit. For the follower of any particular religion is justified from his standpoint in believing his own to be better than all others, and all others inferior to his own. It is absurd, however, to accord to the Jew superior skill, talent and wisdom in the sciences and the professions, the arts and in commerce, and then forsooth, out of a spirit of liberality to tolerate him in these walks of life.

The individual Jew of an inferior mold may be tolerated by his superiors from a sense of justice or out of consideration for the people to which he belongs, but the Jews as a class cannot be tolerated, unless they be regarded as inferior. The charge of inferiority is nowhere brought against them. Their religion is denounced, their clannishness condemned, their disposition to live by their wits rather than by manual labor is decried, but mentally, physically and morally they are recognized as occupying as high a plane as those of their competitors in the same walk of life.

In Russia where the religion is a part of the State, there is some logical basis for the exhibition of tolerance, but in countries where church and state are divorced and where the Jew's right as a citizen is as unquestioned as the right of any other member of the community, his liberty, his privileges, his standing in society must depend upon his own merits and not upon the favor of others.

On the other hand, if the Jews should be justly accorded all the rights possessed by other citizens, it should be because as individuals and as a class they are entitled to those rights and have not forfeited them.

If the Jews with justice cry out against persecution and prejudice they must in justice recognize that they must claim no favors. If as a class they are sordid, mercenary, dishonest, unclean, parasitical, bigoted and unproductive as charged against them by their enemies, society has the right to protect itself against them by such measures, offensive and defensive, as are best calculated to insure protection.

The evidence in support of all these indictments must be considered and weighed and a verdict based thereon. It will not do to invoke any high sounding principles of liberality, tolerance or equality by way of demurrer to the accusations. Every society has the right and the duty to protect itself against harm from without and within, and if one remedy is not effectual to secure that protection others may and always will be employed by or against precedent. Civilization is always progressive and invents new methods when old ones fail.

I realize that in America such expressions on my part are apt to be denounced as inconsistent with the genius of American government. But I do not dispair of successfully maintaining the doctrines just announced in the face of any sort of opposition. It must not be forgotten by Americans who live under a written constitution, that they stand almost alone among the great peoples of the earth in their reverence for form in government. Elsewhere than in America form and forms in government are of secondary importance. The objects of government rather than clearly stated principles are avowedly held in the highest esteem in trans-Atlantic and especially in autocratically governed countries. And indeed, however much we honor precedents and bow down before the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution, we, too, if we do a little healthy thinking, must come to see that forms of government are means to an end and not in themselves ends. And so this axiom may be relied on as always true, that when axioms of government clash with its objects, so much the worse for the axioms. Not only is this true in matters of government, it is likewise true in social life.

We may repeat as often as we please the general statement that all men are born free and equal, and that every man has the right to life, liberty, property and the pursuit of happiness and the worship of God according to the dictates of his own conscience, yet when we seek to apply these declarations to practical life and find in any given instance that they enable individuals or classes to so develop their own careers as to unjustly interfere with the rights and liberties of others, we usually find grim facts standing in the way of mere theories.

The principle that each man shall so use that which is his as not to interfere with the rights of others, whether or not it be expressed in the law books or sanctioned by the courts, will find expression, application and execution in the conduct of the public.

The supeme law of all free countries, if not indeed of all countries, is justice, as understood and interpreted by the people. This law formulates itself through the legislative branches of government, but time and again have the people, impatient of a change in the form of the law reasoned above and against these

forms in order to accomplish justice for the time being. Much as we may deplore indignities which are done to the forms of the law at times, we cannot close our eyes to the fact, that whenever an emergency sufficiently great arises, the people will disregard the forms of the law in order to achieve the objects of organized society.

The Jew scarcely needs to be reminded of this truth, for throughout his entire history he has rightfully or wrongfully been subjected to persecutions and indignities that were more frequently in contravention of law than in conformity thereto. He has never been able to shield himself against oppression and tyranny by an appeal to the law. He never will. His case must be broad, based on justice *per se* and not upon the letter of the law. He must submit his case to the bar of public opinion, and it must be tried fairly upon the evidence.

If I have dwelt so long upon this subject, it is because I recognize that if the Jew has been denied so much that is rightfully his, he often claims more than his due. One of these claims most persistently urged, is that there is no Jewish Question; that the Jew is a citizen like every other citizen and that so long as he abides by the law and does not subject himself to criminal prosecution or civil action, his doings are beyond legitimate inquiry by the public at large. This contention on his part would certainly be well based if he claimed nothing further than the right to live in peace, but when he demands social recognition the whole range of his conduct is a legitimate subject of inquiry against which no technical demurrers can be interposed. When he is charged with being sordid, mercenary, parasitical, filthy, clannish and bigoted, he must admit the testimony in support of the charges and if he cannot refute it, must accept the verdict. Nor must the Jew be over sensitive about the inquiry. If with any justice he can point with pride to the history and achievements of his race, he should be grateful rather than indignant at being classed as a member of that race.

The inconsistencies and the unwisdom exhibited in the consideration of the Jewish Question are not to be found altogether on the side of those who are hostile to the Jews. If those who

declaim against the Jew select as types the worst representatives among them, it is too frequently the case that those who declaim in behalf of the Jews have eyes only for the highest exemplars. Someone has justly remarked that the truth lies between extremes and about equi-distant from both.

If the Jews squirm and indignantly protest against Shylock, Fagin and Svengali, they must be consistent and not claim as types Scott's Rebecca and Lessing's Nathan the Wise. The cold truth lies in this: The Jew has never been and cannot be typified. Shylock was an individual and was pictured truly as Shakespeare knew or imagined him. So of Fagin. Dickens was conspicuously strong in pictures from low life, and conspicuously weak in drawing refined people of the upper crust. On the other hand, Rebecca was the picture of a singularly sweet Jewess, while Nathan, the Wise, was a thin disguise for the great Moses Mendelsohn. No people can be fairly judged by its superlatives. The Jews are not and never have been as a class on the high plane of Lessing's hero, or the low plane of Shylock or Svengali. The same may be said of the Christians, Moslems, Buddhists or any other people, nation or race. It would be silly to judge all the Chinese by Confucius, or all the Americans by Benedict Arnold. A race, a people, or a nation must be judged as a whole, and who does not know or study them as such is unfit to judge. When the Jew hater undertakes to judge the Jews by the few unworthy ones within the range of his acquaintance, he commits a grievous wrong. When the Jew, on the other hand, claims for his people that they are truly typified by their best and noblest exemplars they err on the other side.

The history of a race or people must be studied, their achievements and their endurance measured, their failures and triumphs compared, their difficulties estimated and their mission understood. We must look into their art, science and literature, their religion and ideas of government, their social and domestic life. In short, we must grasp the genius of the whole by a close insight into the average or type of the class. Then and not till then can we fairly judge where the people or race is to be placed, and how they shall be treated. These will be judgments based on

facts; not mere outcries of a sentimentalism pitched as the case may be in a key of love or a key of hate.

The Jews doubtless possess many virtues and many faults and these virtues and these faults are not peculiar to them, except so far as they find an emphasis among the Jews. They are a peculiar people and certain qualities physical, intellectual and moral are emphasized in them to such a degree as to be regarded as Jewish qualities. The Jews are not slow to claim these qualities as racial characteristics when the qualities are such as excite admiration, but they are unduly sensitive to a criticism which points out any quality attributed to them as Jews and which is an impairment of their reputation. May not the truth lie in this suggestion; that the success of the Jew, his sobriety, his temperance, his energy, his physical and intellectual superiority are all due to a certain intensity of character inherited and acquired, and that this very intensity operates upon his faults as well as his virtues and lends to them an emphasis not to be observed as a rule among other people. I do not wish to be understood as advancing this as a proposition which commends itself to me as indisputably sound. It does occur to me, however, that much might be said in support of it and that in any event the Jew must patiently recognize that he is constituted like other men, is subject to the same infirmities, amenable to the same temptations and liable to be guilty of the same wrongs, and that when he proceeds in the wrong direction, being more vigorous, more talented and more intense than other people traveling in the same direction, he is liable to go further.

And this might well be admitted without any disparagement to his claim of equality with or superiority to any other people.

After all, the question of greatest interest is, are Jewish tendencies more generally in the right direction than the wrong direction, and is the tendency towards good developing and the tendency towards evil diminishing, or *vice versa?* This is the question in which society at large is greatly interested and the Jews more so. Both must address themselves towards cultivating the tendency towards good and suppressing the tendency

towards evil and in this will be involved the same inquiry as affecting the entire body of society.

I say this because I feel that history, both past and contemporary, will demonstrate that while the Jews as a class have often been superior to their environment, they have never been worse. Both society in general and the Jews in particular should ascertain what qualities and practices peculiar to the Jews have advanced the Jews and made them better, stronger, more talented and more virtuous than other people. And since like causes beget like effects, these qualities should be emulated and imitated by all other members of society and on the other hand whatever is peculiar to the Jew, that impairs his vigor, his talent and his virtue should be discouraged by society at large and eschewed by the Jews.

It is not my purpose here to enter into details as to the virtues or the faults of the Jews. I am not addressing myself to the merits of the Jewish Question, but to the standpoint from which it should be considered. I venture to say, however, that such a commission as I have already mentioned would point out in the light of history, that in the march of civilization the Jew has been a factor for good more than for evil; that today he is advancing civilization more than he retards it; that he possesess many virtues which society would do well to emulate; that there is in his religion nothing of evil to society and elements of good beyond the power of estimation; that in his family life there is exhibited a purity of sentiment and tenderness of relationship and devotion to obligation, that is nowhere equalled; that by assiduity, intensity of purpose, persistency, energy and the capacity for taking pains, he rises to heights that account for his astounding success.

On the other hand they might with justice indicate, that hailing originally from the Orient and having been compelled for twenty centuries to live in a society of his own, debarred from mingling upon terms of social equality with the highest members of society, he has preserved in his tastes much that is characteristically oriental. That his intercourse with the best elements of society has not been sufficiently protracted to enable him to assimilate the refinements of taste and beget a grace which is to be

found only among those who for generations have occupied the plane of the highest gentility. That he is self-asserting to a degree that often makes him obnoxious and that he is very sensitive to criticism. There may be other faults that might be laid at their doors by impartial students. Whatever they be they should be received with patience, considered without irritation and corrected with that resolute spirit and intense purpose which friend and foe alike attribute to the Jew. When the Jewish Question shall thus be studied, it will soon be solved. The success of the Jew may be emulated and even be envied, but there will be no effort to pull him down simply because he is a Jew. Neither will there be any special privileges accorded to him because he is a Jew; nor will he be left free of criticism and adverse judgment because the critic may fear a charge of prejudice. In all things the Jew will stand as does every other citizen—upon his merits, achieving such success as his merits deserve, suffering from such failure as his shortcomings bring about. Then too will it be understood and recognized what is too often now forgotten, that every man's success in the main must depend upon himself.

In all the affairs of life, apparently within man's control, we are prone to play at Providence. We love to regulate everything so as to bring about or maintain an equilibrium as we understand it. If one is too strong we try to weaken him. If another is too weak we try to strengthen him, always having in view to make the contest equal. Our continued failures do not deter us from continuing the effort and perhaps it is best for us that we should keep on trying. If it does no one else good, it does him good who tries.

But in the race of life between peoples, neither individuals nor governments can make rules or change them. The inexorable law is fixed by nature under the guidance of nature's God. The track is broad, the course long and beset with difficulties. The racers are without handicaps of any kind. The start in the final race is even; there are no favorites. The contest begins with the tap of the bell and ends only when the winner comes under the wire. There is no "weighing in" to test the weights, and

the prize goes to the victor without regard to pedigree or age. Pluck, speed and endurance must win. It may be hard on the beautiful and well-backed contestants who lag behind, but no heart-aches of defeat, no humiliation on the part of the loser should impel us to change the rule of the race. There would be less elation and less sorrow if the prize were equally divided, but without such elation and sorrow there would be no great contestants. It is by victory and defeat, through joy and sorrow, that we achieve civilization, progress and betterment. The battle to the strong, the race to the swift seems cruel but it is the law, which we would not change if we could, for we realize its lofty quality—it is Justice.

The application of this law to the relations between the Jew and the civilization of which he is a factor is all that he may ask and less than which cannot with justice be accorded to him. Let no misguided friend of the Jew ask for sentimental favor because of the great beacon lights in history upheld by the Jews. Let no misguided foe of the Jews turn his back upon that history and subject them to oppression. Let justice be done, equal and exact justice, in all respects equal and in all respects exact.

THE INTELLECTUAL AND ETHICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE AMERICAN JEW.

By Leo. N. Levi.

In treating of my subject, it becomes, in a measure, necessary to consider the history of the Jews in America, for that their history not only states but fully explains their mental and moral evolution.

Leaving out of consideration the few pioneers who came to the United States in the early days, we may, for the purpose in hand, say that our children compose the third generation of Israelites in this country.

To the end that the progress achieved may be made clear, I propose to examine each of the three generations in turn, and shall endeavor to find the type of each era. The difficulties of such an undertaking are not to be mistaken or disregarded. The synthetic process by which from great numbers we form a typical representative is rarely successful. The scope of human observation is so limited, the fallibility of human discernment so common, and the critical quality so rare, that very seldom, indeed, is a so-called type more or less than the sum of the impressions created on the observer by a few elements of the class sought to be typified. When we reflect further, that the deepest impressions are made by extravagant characteristics, we must recognize the danger of mistaking a caricature for a type. This danger has been realized the world over, in respect to the Hebrews. Writers and artists, as a rule, present as a typical picture of the Jew an exaggeration of the worst specimen with whom they have come in contact. Thus, in literature, it is common to find the Jew as bent in form, ugly in feature, vulgarly gaudy, disgustingly unclean, speaking a miserable jargon, wholly wanting in cul-

ture, and exhibiting a moral corruption that passes all comprehension. He is painted as a low, cunning and vindictive creature, who cringes to power and domineers over weakness. If any virtue whatever be attributed to him, it is carefully minimized by looking at it through the wrong end of the same glass which was skilfully employed to enlarge his shortcomings. And this process of depiction, which is in daily use, is called art. If the Jew protests against being made the target of unjust prejudice, he is assured that art loves truth and eschews prejudice. He is told that, like the camera, art represents what stands before it, registering the lights and shades, the straight and the crooked lines. Nor may this be gainsaid; but shall we call them artists who clothe virtue in the garments of sin and "apparel vice like virtue's harbingers?" The true artist seeks and finds truth in its nakedness and purity. Error, though tenacious of life, yields at last to time; but truth is immortal. The creed, the government or the people that is permeated by or built upon error must inevitably perish from the earth; and whatsoever endures, despite the destructive friction of ages, may be safely credited, in its genesis and its career, with the lasting elements of truth, that "tire time and torture." This is the ultimate of all criteria, and where shall be found the measure of the test save in the Jew? The prejudice against the descendants of Israel is slowly but surely receding before the march of genuine enlightenment. The nations of the earth, one by one, are coming to see that their numbers, power and influence, after centuries of oppression, evidence the sterling stuff of which they are made, and denounce the grotesque knave who is dignified by false art with the honorable designation of the Jew. It could not, without disgrace to the world, be otherwise. If the sordid creature, in whom the Israelites have been caricatured, typifies the race, what apology can civilization offer for Jewish prestige and power in everything of which civilization makes boast? Shall it be admitted that in the long march of events ignorant cunning has triumphed over intelligent thought; that courageous honor has yielded to craven depravity and that free and manly virtue has receded before servile sin? Assuredly not.

The Jew is neither saint nor devil.

He never was more than man with all of man's frailties nor less than man with all of man's aspirations towards the divine ideal. But in some respect he differs from all other men and in these specific differences are to be found the true elements of the Jewish type.

When he has faltered and fallen by the way it was because of the human weakness that at times forces the bravest to yield; but in always rising from defeat to victory he has displayed the sublime courage that he alone has truly learned from the sweetest singer of Israel: "Thou shalt not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day. Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor the destruction that wasteth at noonday."

Let us then look upon this people in relation to our subject, as men, moved and swayed like other men, and only differing from other men in the characteristics which typify them. These characteristics are no peculiarities in dress or speech; they are not mere idiosyncracies of manner, nor depravities of heart or mind. On the contrary they are inherent qualities, modified, it is true, but not radically altered, by the history which those qualities have made. The history of the Jew has been to him like the banks of a stream. They confine and mark the boundaries of the current and in a large measure determine its course, and yet the stream makes and changes its banks and works its own passage to the sea.

The Jew began his career with a mission. To fulfill it he was endowed with certain qualities. He has met obstacles that have impeded and delayed him; he has been forced to deviate from the direct route and often to retrace his steps, but his course has been as unceasingly onward as that of the stream, which starting from some mountain top, channels its way through and around the loftiest hills in its journey to the ocean's level. And as the stream which started with only crystal water becomes at times impure by the deposit taken from its banks, so the Jew whose mission is divinely pure, has taken on dross from his environments. When normal conditions are restored in the current of the stream the

impure matter is precipitated and the water is restored to its original clearness. Perhaps it will be so with him.

Israel was chosen as a nation of priests to teach to all the nations that God is one, that his commandments make up the only true moral code, and that the highest virtue and therein the greatest happiness is only attainable through the worship of God and the observance of his statutes. For such a stupendous task, the final performance of which was then and is yet so remote, no ordinary qualities were sufficient. It required long preparation to fit them for the undertaking. The idolatrous spirit which again and again made them forsake their Creator had to be eliminated. The carnal appetite that made them hunger for the flesh-pots in preference to liberty had to be curbed. In lieu of the cowardice natural to newly emancipated slaves, they had to be invested with unflinching courage. But they had able and inspired teachers, and after the prophets and sages had devoted themselves to the great work of education we find that this nation of slaves had become indeed a nation of priests fully equipped for the grandest mission ever imposed upon any people. Not in vain was Moses meek and Joshua bold; not in vain was Solomon wise and David eloquent with music whose cadence has not yet died away. By persuasion, conviction and force, with music and speech and fire and sword the education proceeded until throughout Israel there existed unwavering faith in God and unfaltering observance of his decrees. The Assyrians and the Persians, the Greeks and the Macedonians, the Carthagenians and Romans in turn ruled the world with a temporary power founded solely on prowess in the field—but the Jews alone maintained the faith and practices upon which all true civilization is founded. The Roman arms leveled the walls of Jerusalem, the Roman legions desecrated the temple and scattered the nation of Israel, but the fugitive and hunted Jews even in their flight hugged to their starving bosoms the divine Torah. Such was the people that then began their endless wanderings; the saddest story in history. It is a story of murder, robbery, rapine, oppression, contumely and debasement to which the Jews were almost continually subjected for 1,800 years. Church, State and society combined in unceasing

warfare on the Jew. He was allowed neither freedom of conscience, thought, property nor person. He was denied the pursuit of happiness and the worship of God. These were his environments for centuries; these were the banks through which coursed for ages the limpid waters that had their initial flow even beyond Sinai. It is not so amazing that the stream has become more or less impure, as that it has not been dried up and lost.

How beautifully has a gifted daughter of the race depicted the martyrdom and debasement of her people:

"Day long I brooded upon the passion of Israel,
I saw him bound to the wheel, nailed to the cross, cut off by the sword, burned at the stake, tossed into the seas.
And always the patient, resolute martyr-face arose in silent rebuke and defiance
A Prophet with four eyes; wide gazed the orbs of the spirit above the sleeping eyelids of the senses
A Poet, who plucked from his bosom the quivering heart and fashioned it into a lyre.
A placid-browed Sage, uplifted from earth in celestial meditation.
These I saw, with princes and people in their train; the monumental dead and the standard bearers of the future.
And suddenly I heard a burst of mocking laughter, and turning I beheld the shuffling gait, the ignominious features, the sordid mask of the son of the Ghetto."

It is at such a stage in the career of Israel that the history of the American Jew begins.

When persecution had accomplished in many portions of Europe, the result so graphically described by the poetess; when the most prominent, because almost the only apparent characteristics of the Jew, were narrow bigotry, low cunning and ignorant superstition, a new light shed its flickering rays upon his sombre fate. Through the dark and squalid alleys and into the dismal homes of the Jewish quarters in Germany, Poland, Russia and the Balkan Provinces crept strange, uncertain tidings of a country far beyond the seas. There came from the lips of ignorant news-

bearers at second or third hand, strange rumors that there was one country where freedom prevailed. As if to a fairy tale, bearded men and hooded women listened to stories of the Great Republic. They knew little of its geography, less of its history and scarcely anything of its institutions. They had not heard of the Declaration of Independence; they did not dream of our bill of rights and our peerless Constitution. Scarcely was there room in their shrunken minds for the idea of civil, religious or social liberty. But as tidings followed tidings, there quickened in the barren souls a long smouldering aspiration. They thrilled with an awakening love of liberty, like a long caged bird that sees in its declining years its prison door ajar. The stripling whose bent figure thus early patterned after that of his sire, stood erect under the glorious inspiration of hope. The eye that glittered only in cunning now shone with the lustre born of lofty ambition. The youthful breast heaved in tumultuous agitation, and the sluggish blood leaped from the heart like a high bred charger in battle. And when the first exhilaration had subsided there remained a determined and restless purpose to seek the New Jerusalem. The love of home and kindred, the dread of strange lands and of strange people, the terror of the sea and a thousand "horrible imaginings" had to be overcome before the youth could make the grand venture. But the hour came. The mother's tears were exhausted, the father's misgivings were quieted, the farewell caresses and blessings were bestowed, and the adventurer crept from his home with the humility of a slave in his demeanor, but the spirit of a hero in his bosom. We can fancy him now in his grotesque attire, plodding along the highway to the seaside, carrying his humble wardrobe in his modest bundle, and husbanding every penny lest the scanty store should not suffice to secure him a steerage passage. We can see him embarking on a journey, to him as fearful as that of the "world-unveiling Genoese."

A transatlantic voyage is now a trifling matter; but fifty years ago it was so serious that only emergencies of great moment were deemed sufficient to warrant it. And especially was this true among the poor and illiterate. There was neither comfort nor certainty for them at any stage of the long trip. They were

cooped in the filthy holds of slow sailing vessels, compelled to furnish and prepare their own food, and battle unaided with the horrors of sea-sickness. Small wonder it is that only brave spirits dared it. The Jew, however, rose to the requirements of the occasion then, as he always has. He triumphed over every obstacle. He made his way to the seaboard through strange countries, and embarked among strangers who hated even the name of Jew. He survived the sufferings of the voyage, and with renewed hope and courage set his foot for the first time on free soil. For those who have not experienced it, it is impossible to properly appreciate the extent of the revolution made in his life by his emigration to America. He left behind him everything that was calculated to degrade him; he faced every opportunity to elevate himself. Accustomed at home to regard himself as socially and politically the inferior of those about him, he now found himself in an atmosphere of liberty and equality, and learned that neither race nor religion barred his way. He discovered here a field open to all alike, in which the highest patent of nobility was unsullied manhood.

Such a change was worth all the dangers and privations endured to attain it, and which would not have been braved but for a consummation so precious. It was not a mere desire to attain wealth that induced this exodus from Europe. This is easily demonstrated. In England, France, Italy and Turkey the majority of Jews were then and are now poorer in purse, and the opportunities for the acquisition of riches little, if any, better than in Russia, Austria, Germany and the Balkan provinces; yet we find that very few Jews have come to America or gone elsewhere from the countries first named, while from the latter there has been a steady stream. In England, France, Italy and Turkey a measurably humane disposition has been exhibited towards the Hebrews and they have become attached as patriots to the countries wherein, if they may not rise to greatness, they are at least not driven to despair. In Russia, Germany, Austria and the Balkan provinces they have been subjected to all manner of indignities to degrade and persecute them, and, in consequence, they sought

for avenues of escape. These indignities explain the low stage to which the Jews, subjected to them, sunk. In no other way can we account for the difference between the Israelites in countries where they enjoy some liberties and those in which they enjoy none.

To guard against misconception it may be well to remark that not all the Jews who came to America, half a century ago, were from the countries in which the Jews were oppressed. Neither were those who came from the latter places, all ignorant and degraded. As a matter of fact, there were immigrants from all parts of the world, and not a few were distinguished for learning, character, and even occasionally for wealth. But this minority did not come because they were Jews. They came, as many others did for change, excitement, love of adventure, or the determination to improve even upon the conditions they left behind. It is not proposed to deal with individuals or small minorities. Neither shall I undertake to describe each phase of motive or character. What is sought is the mental and moral type of the Jews who came in considerable numbers to this country something like fifty years since.

Composite photography is employed to ascertain physical types by an extensive system of averages. In physical types the most frequently recurring and most prominent characteristics will impress themselves upon the typical result. In this delineation, likewise, the picture takes its form and color from the most frequently recurring and prominent characteristics of the European Jews who first came in numbers to America.

The result is dismal enough, although not devoid of commendable features. In it we find superstition, religious bigotry, cunning, blunted moral perceptions, rude manners, ignorance and almost a total absence of culture. On the other hand we discover thrift, energy, courage and hope, and underlying all the peculiarly Jewish qualities of quick perception, frugality, temperance and the fullest complement of domestic virtues. Such was the Jew who fled from the narrow limits allowed him in Europe to make a career amidst the boundless and countless opportunities that opened to him here. His past fixed the goal of his ambition by

comparison. He had been an inferior socially and politically. His political equality was granted by our constitution, and he resolved to attain social equality by the shortest route that his wit could discover. His course was determined alike by choice and by circumstances. He saw at a glance that this was a country rich only in natural resources, and that to develop these capital was indispensable. He saw further, that as we had no aristocracy founded on lineage or government regulation, that success in the absorbing employments of the people would create the society of the future. The development of the natural wealth of the country engrossed all attention, and he who should exercise the highest influence and wield the greatest power in this direction would outstrip his neighbors in the race of life. Wealth was the avenue of power. In new countries this is usually the case, and ours was no exception.

Circumstances best fitted him for a money-making career. In Europe either by law or custom, he had been allowed to pursue no other. He was unfitted for the learned professions or the tilling of the soil. He understood something of commercial principles and was an adept in mere trade. Accordingly he became a peddler and later a merchant. But the resolution to become rich did not carry itself into effect. To fulfil it taxed his energy, thrift and wit to their fullest capacity. Besides he labored under many disadvantages peculiar to himself. His dress, his manners, his language and his strict adherence to the forms of religion all impeded him. These impediments he removed as speedily as possible. He conformed to the dress and manners of the country, acquired sufficient of the language for the purposes of trade, and one by one ignored the religious ceremonies that proved inconvenient. When we consider that he had no social obligations, no political ambition, no extravagant personal habits, and that he was frugal, industrious and shrewd, we shall understand how readily he succeeded in his chosen career. His early success was fruitful of mischief. It changed the goal of his desires. He had sought wealth as "a stepping stone to higher things," but he became intoxicated by the charm of money getting until his ambition now grown gross by the food

on which it had fed, looked upon wealth itself, as its highest aspiration. He toiled and schemed only for money and he felt, if he did not exhibit, contempt for all occupations that did not lead to wealth. He identified riches with happiness and sought them as eagerly as ever the alchemist sought the elixir of life. Then well nigh perished that precious essence of the ideal that has ever pervaded the Jewish nature and emphasized its difference from all others. It was this idealism that sustained the Jew amid the severest of his trials and to which he ever had resort for consolation. When driven to practice his religion in secret and therein find his only solace for sorrow, he drew upon his oriental imagination for a symbolism that appealed to his ideal emotions. Thus there had slowly but steadily accumulated for his observance a countless number of rites and ceremonies, which, originally introduced to satisfy his emotional nature, had come to be regarded as obligatory upon his conscience. Nothing saved many of these practices from being ludicrous, but the sincerity and earnestness of their observance. When we consider how sudden a revolution occurred in the lives of the first Jewish immigrants to America we shall better understand some of its results. At no time has the history of the Jews been separable from the history of Judaism. Whether the connection between the doctrines of that ancient religion and the people to whom they were given, be divinely ordained and therefore absolute, or not, certain it is that thus far the race and the religion have been so fused, as it were, that none can say just where the one begins and the other leaves off. Judaism has always been not only a part of every Jew's life, but of every event in it. Thus it was an integral part of the thought, philosophy and education of those who came to this country until after they had become Americans. But no sooner had their minds quickened with the new civilization and their eyes opened to the new deliverance than an anti-climax occurred. Here was life, bustle, achievement; here was an open field for energy and ambition where the race was to the swift, and the battle to the strong. Time was too precious to devote to ceremonies that consumed the half of it almost, and thus

trenched upon the opportunities for success. Besides, the views generated by the broad scope of the new career condemned one by one the rabbinical ordinances imposed as they were for ends that they had outlived. The logical process by which these hitherto sacred obligations were laid aside, if not accurate was forceful, quick and ruthless. No pause was indulged in to analyze the differences between essentials and non-essentials. Consistency was elevated above all other considerations, and having reconciled himself to a disregard of some part of his religion, the Jew deemed it due to consistency that he should ignore almost, if not all, of it. But this did not endure long. The immigrant, like the balance of mankind, was a social animal. He required for his happiness home, wife and children. Not for always could he content himself with sleeping in barns and under hedgerows; not for always could he endure the half hidden contempt of his fellowmen without a longing for some sphere in which he was the peer of his fellows. Then arose the family relation, and the influence of the mothers in Israel became apparent. It communicated itself to the home, and the heap of ashes which marked the ruins of his religion received repentant and longing glances from the husband and father. Not only this, but in his home where comfort prevailed there seemed a spectre of rebuke. In the stillness of the night, at the festive board, at the bedside of the sick and dying, at births and marriages and burials, a voice that was storm-driven across seas uttered ominously in his ears the command to "Honor thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land." Nor did the voice cease when gifts were sent to aged parents to make the poverty that saddened their lives disappear. It continued to sound until at last when the restless heart cried out, "What is it I must do?" the voice changed to the tender accents of dying fathers and mothers wafted softly over the bosom of the deep: "Hear Oh, Israel the Eternal is our God, the Eternal is One." Honor us in loving the Lord "with all your heart and all your soul and all your might." Then amid the cold ashes of the discarded religion was sought the divine spark of truth that yielded not to the agencies that could destroy mere forms, and lo! it was there radiant, vital and eternal. Thus was

saved on American soil the Judaism without which there can be no Jews.

Its influence was soon apparent. Where it was possible synagogues were erected, benevolent societies organized and schools instituted. And when, because of differences in nationalities and shades of belief, discords arose in the house of God, the inventive mind of the Jew established a great society formed upon such broad principles that in respect of them no contention could arise. I cannot pause even to outline the history of the B'nai B'rith. It is unnecessary to do so here. I only refer to it to show that when the pioneer Jews were still earnestly engaged in making money they demonstrated their claim to the highest virtues by the grand efforts they made to elevate and enlighten their fellow-men and alleviate their sufferings on the broadest principles of humanity.

There was much in the first generation that we will not find in the second. The first generation brought with it from Europe some qualities that have not been transmitted and it imperfectly acquired some that were born with the second.

I have already sketched the type of the first generation at the time of the landing on American soil and in some respects the effect produced by contact with the new civilization. The picture would be wanting, however, in one of the essential features if I failed to give proper prominence to one effect of the change. The immigrant as a rule was scantily educated if at all, and not infrequently the entire sum of his learning did not extend beyond the Bible and the commentaries thereon. Beyond this he knew little except some general principles of trade and barter. He was unambitious in Europe to shine either as a scholar, artist or man of means, because as a scholar or artist he was practically denied a career without becoming an apostate, and to advertise his wealth was to invite plunder or confiscation. In Europe he had been inferior to every rank in society and the humility natural to his position had degenerated into servile deference to his fellow creatures. The sudden emancipation from such conditions was bewildering. He exulted in his freedom to an extent that was rather ludicrous than offensive. He became pompous in the assertion of his equality with all men under the law and vulgar

in the ostentatious display of the wealth he so quickly acquired. His house was furnished lavishly but with little taste, and he imitated without discriminating judgment, the indulgences rather than the essentials of polite society. Seeing society only on the surface he was excusable for appreciating only its gloss and when, as he thought, he had successfully acquired what he saw, he speedily claimed to be a gentleman. He wore good clothes, lived in a fine house, drove fine horses, frequented fashionable resorts, gambled and dissipated as he daily saw gentlemen do, and in truth believed himself one of the elect. His children were taught at home to dress well and spend money, and at expensive rather than efficient schools and under fashionable rather than competent masters acquired a desultory education without the benefit of parental direction.

These children, who formed the second generation, grew up with uncertain feelings towards their elders. They had been taught to look with admiration to the polish rather than to the true metal of society. Their minds had been filled with an exaggerated idea of the importance of wealth and an underestimate of the frugal methods by which it can alone be acquired with safety. They naturally knew the English language, and derisively laughed at the jargon of their seniors, and finally they were left either without a thorough understanding of their religion, or were so confused by the discords among theologians and the ignorance of their parents, that they looked upon religion with lofty unconcern or contempt.

In the good results of early religious training, in the domestic virtues, in the faithful observance of the marriage vow, in the practice of temperance and in physical development the second generation was unquestionably behind the first. But on the other hand, the child was born on free soil and wore his freedom without effort; he was more manly and more scrupulous in his dealings with the world. He was better educated, more refined, more cultivated than his sire. His good clothes sat naturally upon him; he knew what to do with and in his fine house, and he learned that society makes polish, and that mere polish and glitter do not make society. Many of them eschewed trade alto-

gether, and devoted themselves to literature, science and art. They became actors, painters, musicians, lawyers, doctors and chemists. Indeed they made a vast stride forward from the position occupied by their immediate progenitors—without fully covering the ground, however, between the starting point and the goal. The second generation derided the vulgar claims of the first, without appreciating that in kind but not in degree it was guilty of a like presumption. But what of the third generation?

The seed has been planted, the grain waves green in the fields—what will the harvest be?

We are the husbandmen, and upon us rests in the largest measure the balance that shall be struck in the aftermath.

The influences that operate on every plant began with creation. Climatic conditions and changes, seismic disturbances, cyclones and tidal waves in ages long since forgotten, have all in turn contributed some factor in the destiny of each seed that is placed beneath the sod. But the immediate and almost controlling influence is the skill and energy of the farmer, who studies the surrounding circumstances for lessons of wisdom to overcome the almost numberless difficulties that occur between sowing and garnering. The little ones who play about our knees, who load our hearts with solicitude, yet lighten them of sorrows —they compose the third generation. They are the tender plants which we are charged with carrying to fruitful maturity. Upon their lives influences have been at work from remotest ages, but with us still rests the controlling force that shall shape their careers.

The harvest will depend upon the husbandman; and of us it is thus spoken. Let us consider what we should aspire to do in the premises and how our aspirations may be realized.

All parents whose natures are not abnormally corrupt, desire the success of their offspring—but few are agreed as to what is success. In the eyes of some it means wealth or power, or fame, or learning, or several or all of these combined. By a minority only, these are all but incidents in the careers of the young with which heaven has blessed them. To them wealth, power, fame and learning are glorious achievements indeed, but not the end

upon which their lofty gaze is fixed. Their ambition is to make their children rise to the highest plane of manhood and womanhood and deserve the praise which man and the favor which God bestows upon true gentility. And what is true gentility? It is to achieve prosperity by honorable effort, to attain power by the influence of spotless conduct, to gain fame by good works, to acquire wisdom by the study of nature and of nature's God, and above all to refine and elevate the spirit by thinking the pure rather than the corrupt and by doing always the good and never the evil. This it is to be the perfect gentleman or the perfect lady.

The father who toils to lay up riches for his sons and daughters and trains them to guard and increase his store, ignoring or slighting the nobler aims of life, performs a sorry service. He gives them the power to satisfy their carnal appetites, but denies them the ineffable sweets that are enjoyed even in poverty by those who lead the intellectual and ethical life. And what is power that is not based upon and guided by wisdom and love; or fame that does not attach to nobility of soul; or learning that leads not to wisdom, and the practice of virtue? They are all but the outward trappings that at first dazzle the beholder only to become grotesque and hideous when closer inspection reveals the contrast with what is thus gaudily concealed.

If you would make your children successful, train them to deserve success. If you would have them be rich, teach them not only how to acquire riches, but how to use them. If you would have them powerful, educate them to attain power for noble ends. If you would have them learned, let their learning be so achieved that it shall lead to the wisdom that so often lingers stubbornly behind the course of knowledge. If you would make them successful, you must teach them to be happy, and to be happy they must be honest, truthful, brave, upright, self-sacrificing and God fearing. In a word, to be happy they must be virtuous. This truth, though trite, cannot be too often repeated, for like most truths it passes unchallenged and unappreciated, until at last it dawns upon the mind that therein lies a treasure undiscovered before.

How shall the lofty ideal which I have pictured be realized?

What arts shall the husbandman employ to make the harvest bountiful and good? I answer you with a truth as trite as the one just mentioned—education. Educate the body, educate the mind, but above all educate the heart. I cannot present any system of education in this disquisition, but I venture to suggest that you become in some respects the teachers of your own children. Interest yourselves in their sports and pleasures. Take part in them and give them such direction and scope that will promote healthy physical development and divert the young minds from defiling associations. Assist them in their studies and make their labors agreeable rather than irksome. Stimulate their ambitions by rewards and overcome their discouragements with sympathy. Teach them by precept and example the nobility of virtue. Nourish the sentiment so natural in children for the true, the beautiful and good. Teach them self-denial, truthfulness, honesty, courage, charity and piety. Let no incident, however trivial, go by without making it leave upon their impressionable minds some lesson of wisdom or goodness.

Is this asking too much of fathers who have the cares of business, and of mothers occupied by the duties of housekeeping? Perhaps so if the business or the house is to be set up as a fetich to which the little ones are offered as sacrifices. But if you pursue your occupation or keep your house for your children's sake, as you should, then whenever one must suffer, spare the children. Do not embellish a cage in which to imprison their natures; do not feed their stomachs with rich food and keep their minds and hearts on starvation diet.

To paint the first and second generation has been a comparatively easy task. To point the way for the third has not been more difficult; but to foretell its fate would require the gift of prophecy. I am, however, full of hope. Under normal or favorable conditions the Jews have always advanced, and I anticipate no exception here. The second generation has, in many material respects, improved vastly on the first, and if we can only come to see how far we are below the standard we should aspire to, we will be better equipped to advance our children beyond ourselves. We are quick enough to recognize the difference between

ourselves and our immediate predecessors; but with that self-complacency so common to all mortals, we are slow to find lingering in us many of the shortcomings of our ancestors, not to mention those that have been derived from our environments, not inherited from our forefathers. If you would do your full duty to your children, first learn to what extent you have failed in your duty to yourself. Sum up your own qualities of head and heart, and estimate in what degree you would have your children surpass you. Nor is this all. Study, in the light of your great responsibilities, how you should demean yourself in order to bear them with credit. Remember that children are imitative. Remember that they will copy your faults as well as your virtues. If you are indifferent about your religion, they, too, will be indifferent, and without religion you cannot teach the only character of morality worthy of respect. You may, indeed, without religion teach honesty by pointing to the prison as the destiny of thieves. You may teach regard for human life by taking your children to a hanging; but if you would make them love the right for the sake of the right, and not merely eschew the wrong from fear of consequences, then you must instil into their young minds and hearts the great principles underlying all religions and furnished to them all by the Jews. Remember, too, that if you would guard your children against race prejudice, you and they must rise superior to it. You can no more escape bigotry by shrinking from Jewish designations, habits, customs, or religious practices than the ostrich can escape his pursuers by burying his head in the sand. Be brave and teach your children courage. Do not obtrude your race or religion upon public notice, but never withdraw them from the eye of friend or foe. They are here, parts of yourself, and you stamp yourself an inferior whenever you shrink from the name or responsibilities of your people or your creed. Nothing excites such contempt and hatred as disloyalty. The military leader who profits by the treachery of an enemy, while loving the treason despises the traitor. It is true in every relation of life. The renegade is ever abhorred. The renegade Jew is despised by all broad-minded

Gentiles and Jews for his disloyalty, while the fanatics who induce his apostasy contemn him for having once been a Jew.

But there exists no occasion to warn Jews against apostasy. It is not conversion to other religions so much as indifference to our own that gives us pause. I foresee, however, a better era in respect of this. The dissensions raging among theologians are being settled or settling themselves. The mists are lifting from the minds of the laymen, and they will rescue the essentials of Judaism from the ruins made by mere destructionists. Out of the chaos that reigns there will emerge the vital principles and practices that have always made Judaism not only a great system of philosophy, but also a matchless religion. See to it that you do your part and direct aright the efforts of your children. Take pride in your people and be a pride unto them. Do not despise them lest you be despised of all men. Elevate your race through yourself and your offspring, and look forward with hungry ambition to the hour when it shall be recognized as a proud distinction to be one of the chosen people. That hour, I confidently believe, can be and will be realized in America. With all circumstances in favor of us, and native qualities that are unrivalled, we shall progress surely upward from what we are to what we should be, as rapidly as we have risen from what we were to what we are. This is the mission of our children and our children's children, and they, if not we, shall live to see the time when, in the eyes of all men, no epitaph will contain such apparent and eloquent eulogy as the brief announcement, "Here sleeps a true son of Israel." To deserve such lofty praise is greater than to wear by right the richest crown that ever rested on a royal head.

THE AMERICAN JEW.

Synopsis of address at a banquet given in honor of D. G. L. No. 7, I. O. B. B. at New Orleans, La.

It is a singular term. It carries with it no political association. When the American is found abroad and the estimate is made of him by others, he stands as a representative of the country, which is a kindergarten of liberty for all the world; he exemplifies the spirit meant by Grover Cleveland when he said, in opening the "World's Fair," that this was the country which made men. Gladstone paid tribute to the country of 3,000,000 men which framed an organic law to withstand the test of time, and said it must have been an inspiration from God. A civilization has been builded here, which despite the sneers of Europe, has brought all nations to the feet of Columbia paying tribute. This inestimable liberty should be guarded against anything which might impair its beauty and its strength. It is a country of refuge, but those who seek refuge here must not only eat of the bread of America, but partake also of American doctrines. He is proud of being an American, but he has another lineage, not inconsistent with the other, of which he was equally proud. If there was inspiration in the American constitution, how much more inspiration must there have been in the code written thousands of years ago, only a few hundred words, which fitted then, has never failed to fit, and will fit for all time. The Jew gave the Decalogue as the foundation of civilization.

The Jew is the nobleman of all time, whose lineage goes back before written history to traditions, which all men admit because all men know them to be true. But today he claims American citizenship as his proudest title, next only to that of "American Jew." Four hundred years ago the Jews were ex-

pelled from Spain. Four hundred years ago America was discovered, and here he has found freedom of conscience and of action. He has become an American citizen and intends to remain one, claiming of the blessed mother of liberty those blessings bestowed by her upon those who deserve it. He offered to her the testimonial of obedience to law and charity irrespective of creed. When the persecuted Jew comes to these shores the Jews already here could promise that he would become no burden, breed no disorder, renounce all allegiance to other countries and devote himself to acquiring the principle of citizenship. The children the members had seen today, were the hostages that the Jews would rear, good citizens: the race and the religion would never become objects of barter.

The speaker contrasted the expulsion of the Jews from Russia and their reception in America, and they have been casting aside their disability, so as also to deserve the title of the "American Jew." He called attention to the twin article in the North American Review upon the "Sweating" system, which spoke of the victory won in New York. It was because the laborers were Jews, Russian Jews, and the article said that it was because of their "dignity of endurance and courage to abide by the law" that they won their fight against capital. He repeated his own experiences with the immigrants, who were given the declaration of independence and the American constitution translated into their jargon. A week later they returned with questions as to certain points in the constitution, showing that they had really begun the study of the American doctrine. There is talk of a German vote, and an Irish vote, but never of a Jewish vote. Judaism was a faith which would not suffer the indignity of political speculation. New York is a close state and in 1896 there will be 60,000 Jewish votes in New York City. If manipulated as a whole it might settle the question of the presidency, but such a matter would be as impossible as quenching the sun with a glass of water. The Baron Hirsch relief committee is made up of men prominent in both political parties, and if one of them were to attempt such a thing he would be ostracized from his fellows and his plan de-

stroyed. The Jewish people is a people capable of learning something and forgetting much, taking care of the poor, building up such structures as this asylum, making new citizens of outcast orphans, making them men for soldiers and citizens, and women for wives, and they can hurl back with defiance the charge of Chandler that they are not entitled to become American citizens.

The future should be judged by the past. The Jews of today came here fifty years ago much the same as the Russian refugees, and have done much for themselves and their country. They have upheld commerce on land and sea, promoted science and art, advanced in literature and have been loyal to the commonwealth in peace and in war. Somebody said the Jew was not a soldier. When the roll was called, more Jews were found on the side of the Confederacy alone than the proportion of Jews to the population of the entire country. If the men on either side were asked they would say that they met Jews doing duty in the face of danger. There was nothing to be ashamed of in the record, and he prophesied that the handful of American Jews here today with their hands uplifted by their American co-workers of other faiths, would lead to the same place the Russian outcast, so that when the enemies of the Jews went upon the hilltops and looked upon the industrious Jewish emigrants in the fertile valleys below they would exclaim, "How beautiful are thy tents, Oh, Jacob; thy tabernacles, Oh Israel!"

ORGANIZED CHARITIES.

Address delivered by Mr. Leo. N. Levi at the Annual Meeting of the United Hebrew Charities.

Certainly there is no greater cause than that which has brought us together here to-night, and I am impressed with the conviction that no man should allow the promotion of that cause to suffer in the slightest degree by any lust for glory or fame. And I believe that the few thoughts that I have to express will be more effective if, in an informal way, they come to you, not as the utterances of some wiseacre speaking downward from the platform, but as the thoughts of a co-worker in the ranks, addressed to his co-workers, with the design to provoke thought and excite discussion, in order to reach the truth. This cause, in which we are enlisted requires science rather than art; ideas more than words; and ideas only as impulses to achievement.

I say it calls for science rather than art, because there is no department of human activity that requires more to be reduced to a scientific basis than the administration of charity. It has been said here to-night incidentally that it is no longer an open question that charity should be organized; but I cannot concede the accuracy of the statement when I am confronted as I have been, here and everywhere else throughout this country, with the short list of subscribers to organized charities. If the conviction that charity should only be administered through organization were general and widespread, we could only account for the paucity of subscribers by assuming the want of a charitable impulse among our co-religionists. It is not true that that impulse is wanting. If anything, it exists too strongly, but is too little subject to the control of reason. There is too much of that indiscriminate personal benefaction, which has been so aptly termed by Bishop Potter "the help that hurts."

It is necessary, therefore, for this and kindred organizations not to assume that it is the consensus of opinion that charity should be administered only through organization.

Let me assure you, from a wide experience, that it is yet necessary to do missionary work in that direction, and to educate the people, and the whole people, to a perfect understanding that charity has two aspects; one emotional, the other intellectual. It must proceed from an emotional impulse to do good, it must be directed by an intellectual process that will guarantee the thing desired. And there are still further lessons, the fruit of which must be carried into effect, not only in individual good work, but in corporate good work. Among such lessons is, that all charity must proceed along lines that take no account of self; that the pleasure of the giver, the fame of the giver, the rewards of the giver, shall receive no consideration at all, or if any, in a minor degree; that the great desideratum is effectiveness in the interest of those in whose behalf charity is exhorted.

I hope I make that clear. I would I had the power to make it as clear as it appears to me, that if there be merit in the charity that is done for the pleasure that is extracted from it by the giver, it is not possessed of that character of loftiness, of purity, which attaches to charity that takes no account of self, that looks not for the thrill of pleasure when the tear is dried and the groan is stilled, but is done in response to that small still voice of conscience embodied in our religion from time immemorial, that from him who hath a surplus there shall come to him who hath not, the tithe that is in payment of a debt. I read the other day in the list of contributors to this organization the initials of some one unknown, "in payment of my tithe," and it excited in me a thrill of admiration. I looked forward then, as I do now, to the time when I may grasp the hand that penned those initials, and say I have found one man who has avowedly done his charity as the payment of an obligation, recognizing it as a duty.

I have been told by my learned friends of the cloth—and I always get my religious and biblical learning at second hand from them—that there is no Hebrew word for charity, but that the word we use implies righteousness, signifying that whoever

possesses more than a sufficiency for his own needs is in justice bound to assist those who have not sufficient; that a man in respect to his surplus has a trust, and he is not at liberty to dispose of that trust according to his liking, but only as befits the welfare of the beneficiaries of the trust.

And so I have said before, and I say now, that a charity ill-bestowed is a sin, for the bestowal of alms upon one who is unworthy is the corresponding denial of charity to one who is not. And it shall be no sufficient excuse for any man to say, "I was governed by a good intention." Your duty requires, not only that your intention must be good, but that your intelligence must be good; and if it be not sufficient to solve the problem, turn over your contribution to those who are wiser than you. If these lessons be taught, and taught intelligently to the people, there will come many good results, not only in that we shall minimize the "help that hurts," but in that we shall magnify the help that helps, and we will strengthen the organizations that are inaugurated and conducted along scientific lines.

I purposely use the word scientific. It has been used here to-night repeatedly in the interesting reports read, as if the work that is being performed in the field of charity had already reached a high scientific plane. I do not want to quarrel with anybody who holds to that view, but for myself, I think it does better credit to our intelligence to confess we are in the initial stages of that science. I believe my statement will not be challenged when I say that charity in this day is a branch of political economy, and, I want to add, that, in my opinion, political economy is nothing but common sense applied to big operations. How far have we progressed in the development of that science? Be it understood that it is not the creation of any one man's brain, but the birth of experience; that it has been extracted from the happenings that come under our daily ken.

Scientific charity is of recent birth. Let us study our difficulties rather than our triumphs to the end that the triumphs of the future will surpass the triumphs of the past.

I referred to the fact that the list of regular contributors to organized charity is a very short one. I am well advised of the

conditions elsewhere, and I have learned that the conditions here are not dissimilar. If you take into consideration the fact that but a small percentage of the population is in need of charity, you must realize that a very large percentage is able to bestow charity. And if you compare the number who are able to bestow charity with the number who bestow it, through an organization, you will be amazed and shocked at the inevitable conclusion that only a small percentage of our people do charity. Perhaps this evil condition arises from the want of co-operation and sympathy between those commonly known as the better class and those commonly known as the lower class of our people, a distinction which I do not think I am too critical when I say is largely dependent upon that legend by which we indicate the unit of value. The result of that want of co-operation and sympathy is that the poor man—the man in modest circumstances—does not feel obliged to give his mite to the alleviation of want in others, and a greater burden is imposed upon the rich. And this is evil in more ways than one. It is evil in that when the burden becomes too great, recalcitrancy follows. It is evil in this that if our poor or our people in modest circumstances are not actively engaged in the administration of charities to which they contribute, they are denied the uplifting influence of benefaction, to him who bestows. And the whole community is denied the benefit of their subscription, their practical assistance, their surveillance in the very districts where we suffer most from imposition and chicanery.

My judgment is, that even though it entails trouble, untold trouble, and I know it will, no effort should be spared to make the entire community, rich and poor—each according to his means—contribute to the alleviation of suffering and want, so that whatever our differences in religion, in politics, in social standing, in wealth, in culture, or refinement, in the doing of good, each according to the measure of his power, there should be one level platform upon which every Jew can stand. And there will flow from that union of effort the ultimate and finest achievement of science in charity which has been well exemplified in this great metropolis by the organization whose silver jubilee

we are assembled to celebrate to-night. Because, when all the people are working to a common end, there will be one ideal in charity work which has always been so far and yet so dear, and that is a scientific administration of Jewish charities modeled upon a high form of government.

The need for the United Hebrew Charities brought it into existence, and that need was, the evils that preceded it.

The report that was read here to-night, like the report of every organized charity I have ever been made familiar with, contained a plea for funds, a plea for moral support, a plea for personal activity, and it should always be so—it indicates a healthy condition. But let me call your attention to this: When the list of subscribers to all these institutions is limited in numbers, and burdens come to a point when the back cannot stand an additional pound of weight, it is wise to consider if we cannot do that which is most required and most urgent first. And that can only be done by having a parliament or clearing house. In a well organized government, at the beginning of every fiscal period a budget is made in which there must be wise distribution of the revenues to the various departments thereof, so that the most important shall not suffer by pampering the less important. That is the highest expression of statesmanship. Shall we not in the administration of our charities consider what revenues we can expect to come from our people, and in what avenues these revenues should be directed? Herein lies the highest essential and highest strength of your organization; to demand the help of every man, woman, and child in this community who has anything to give in the way of money, sympathy or effort in the cause of charity.

With the dissipation of effort and division of energies—and traveling sometimes along parallel lines and thus wasting energies that should have been directed otherwise—there come troubles that only an intelligent clearing house such as this can avoid. That idea can be extended still further and should be to the end that we should not furnish niches of fame for ambitious men by unnecessarily multiplying organizations. We should conserve

our energies and direct them straight at the target of want. And how can that be done?

To bring that about let us not refuse to go into associations that are distasteful to us. Let me assure you that no great good is accomplished in anything unless sacrifice precedes its achievement. And if it becomes necessary to communicate with those below you in the social scale to bring about their co-operation in money, time, in sympathy, and in effort, I say you owe that sacrifice to the poor and suffering as well as the money you ungrudgingly give. There is nothing so becoming the lofty station as humility, just as nothing so becomes the lowly station as pride. If those who by the blessing of Providence have reached a high plane will stoop in charity to those on a lower plane, those on the lower plane will be ambitious to reach a higher plane themselves. And in this we can make charity as noble and effective as when we give a crust of bread to the hungry or clothe the naked.

I am admonished by the lateness of the hour that I must not linger longer upon a subject so dear to me and upon which at a more appropriate season I hope to deliver the message I have in mind. The lesson to be learned, is in brief, that we should all learn and teach, that we are not paying our debts, by indiscriminately bestowing charity, that we should avail ourselves of the opportunities that present themselves in a long established, well conducted and absolutely needed institution, and especially in one that exercises a wholesome supervisory influence over all and accomplishes much against those evils the prevalence of which brought this institution into being.

These are lessons to be learned from this occasion, more valuable than the thrill of pleasure that follows a compliment, more valuable because they will lead to something good to be accomplished in the future, rather than to the ecstatic contemplation of something done in the past. I do not appeal to you to carry it to your homes and to your hearts. I demand it, not in my name, not in the name of this organization. I demand it in your name, as the duty that you owe to yourselves, the duty that you inherited from your ancestors, the "noblesse oblige" of the Jews.

LET WOMAN WITNESS.

History is replete with occasions when, because of unique conditions a commonplace utterance has made an enduring impression; when commonplace men became effective agents for good. The studied words of the wise often fall like cinders in a marsh, expiring as they fall; while sometimes the rude expressions of a clown, though containing but a spark of truth, start a conflagration. In olden times the birth of a male child to a Jewish mother was dignified by the remote possibility that he might prove to be the Messiah.

These observations are offered by way of apology for venturing, even in the most unpretentious way, to discuss a religious theme in public. As a rule such discussion should be left to those specially fitted therefor. In departing from that rule, I do so with misgivings, yet hopeful that I may, in a small way, promote a great cause by making a plea for Religion. Not an argument, not an apology, not a defense, but a plea. I do not venture on the domain of either science or theology, for of these it may be truly said "fools rush in where angels fear to tread." It however requires neither scientist or theologian to see how pervasive are immorality and crime, and to measure these by the decadence of religion. It was in former generations, if it is not now, accepted as a current truth, that morality and righteousness followed always in the wake of education. It was assumed that when the windows of the intellect were opened to the light of knowledge, the warmth of virtue would enter the soul. But there has come a disillusionment. Open windows admit both light and warmth at times, but as often if not oftener, sacrifice warmth for light. The world has grown in enlightenment faster than in virtue; indeed one is almost driven at times to the gloomy conviction that virtue abounds most where enlightenment sheds but feeble rays.

I should be unwilling to advance that as a deliberate conviction, but without misgivings I assert that enlightenment without religion is a factitious and unstable support for morality.

It is safe to say that in the decalogue is to be found a comprehensive moral code; certainly so, if it be supplemented with the Mosaic command "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The civilization that is not based on that code is not sound; unless they draw therefrom their inspiration, manhood is not at once stalwart. And gentle womanhood is not free and pure.

And what if anything can make that code the controlling influence upon conduct?

The skeptic will answer that the fear of public opinion and of public law alone controls the conduct of those who are not governed by superstitious fears; or that the mind of man has painfully and slowly spelled out the code, as the dictate of wisdom, supported by reason and sanctioned by almost universal acceptance.

The religious person even though not pious will say that the code ought, of right, and in fact does, truly enter into life because it is the Divine Law. To this last view I hold. Religion occupies different planes, and to reach the highest one must be devout and pious, as well as religious; but the religious spirit abides in the hearts and is reflected in the lives of many who, if not pious and devout, esteem themselves, not more, but less, on that account. For the purposes of this consideration it is not important to draw fine distinctions between grades of loyalty to religion. What I insist on is, that unless virtue is regarded as the mandate of God, its practice cannot be widespread, persistent or enduring. However well we fortify ourselves against temptations, the enemy will break through at times, but when Faith in Heaven is not among the defenders, then is resistance weak indeed. A man cannot exist without air, food and water; he cannot develop his physical powers without exercise. This is true now and it always has been. Why? The answer of science is that the law of man's being so decrees—but this is but another method of saying because it is the will of God.

Man does not reach his true moral development except by

observing the code to which I have adverted. He never has. Why? Again without circumlocution the answer is because it is the Law of God. Man never has attained anything like even an approximate observance of that code, save under the influence of a religion which recognized a Supreme Power possessed of Infinite attributes, making and revealing laws which as far as understood were believed to be perfect, and whether understood or not were accepted as authoritative.

If this statement be true, it furnishes an irresistible argument that religion is a necessity of man's moral being and therefore a Divine Law.

I assume that no one will question the validity of the moral code contained in the ten commandments and the golden rule of Moses. Men differ as to its origin, but not as to its merit.

Whence does it derive its sanction? Is it from common consent? Or to express the same thought differently, from public opinion? If so, this public opinion makes the code moral, and can also unmake it. It follows that it is not immoral to be a polygamist in Turkey; it was not immoral to steal in Sparta; it was not immoral to sacrifice human life to public sport in Rome; to burn Jews at the stake in the Middle Ages.

On the other hand, this code if always recognized and accepted by public opinion, is a remarkable exception, for all other mere creations of the human mind are constantly being modified or altered. If this code has escaped the thirst for change it is because it has the same authority behind it which makes food, air and water necessities of life. Men may quarrel about the origin of the law, but when the law itself is assailed the assault is led and followed only by mental or moral perverts.

The same argument applies to the suggestion that human law requires observance of the salient features of this code, and human government enforces it. This suggestion is not more than fractionally true and even if it were wholly so, what becomes of the code if governmental law comes in opposition thereto? If England, Germany, France and the United States should unite in passing laws to legalize theft, perjury, adultery and murder, would it be less wrong to commit these sins than

it is now? Nay! if all the world should unite in resolutions and laws, that these things were virtues instead of wrongs, would their moral nature change by reason of such resolutions and laws? And if not, why not? Because the Right and the Wrong are not measured by what Man says or does or thinks about them. Men may weave webs of words and cloud the subject, but in the end the mind cannot escape the conclusion that unless it be because God commands, there is no more inherent wrong in theft, perjury, adultery or murder, than in smuggling or carrying on a business without a license.

The virtue that has no higher inspiration than fear of the law or public opinion, is not entitled to the name. The same may be said of the virtue that is based only on considerations of policy. Whenever subjected to a crucial test it fails and proves itself a counterfeit.

It is difficult if not unfair to support this proposition by comparison of one nation with another, or of men differently situated. The superiority of one or the inferiority of another may be attributable to other conditions. But if we find people similarly situated, having the same environment, enjoying common joys, and suffering common sorrows, and discover marked differences in their moral qualities, we may also discover evidence for or against the influence of Religion or Morality. And so I call Woman to witness.

Women are not inherently better or worse than men. The savage woman is as cruel and ferocious as her mate and submits to his rule, not upon principle, but in deference only to his superior physical strength. The women of Greece compared indifferently with the men. They were regarded and treated as inferiors, esteemed chiefly for their physical charms. Aspasia shines forth as perhaps the greatest of Greek women and her claim to greatness must be confined to her beauty and intellect and cannot be extended to her virtues. The women of Rome devoted themselves to the pursuit of pleasure in its most odious aspects. In the circus they looked on brutal and indecent sports with unflinching eyes, and to the questioning glance of the triumphant gladiator made answer with the thumb sign of death.

In the Saturnalia and Lupanarium the noblest dames of Rome were chief actors, losing no caste by engaging in public debauches, which would now be suppressed by law in even a semi-civilized country. Patrician ladies whose husbands were heads of government, commanders of armies, judges, painters, poets and scholars—the very cream of society, paraded their own iniquity and sneered at the eccentric univirae.

In Paris during the 18th century the upper classes set aside the controlling influence of Religion, and in the decadence which followed the women went to greater lengths than the men. In intrigue, treachery, deception, openly scandalous conduct, and even crime, the women were willing partners or rivals of the men. It is needless to multiply historical citations to prove that when neither sex is restrained from wrong-doing by Religion, the women become at least as wicked as the men.

I think it equally true that when men and women are alike influenced by Religion, the virtues of men compare favorably with those of the gentler sex. The truly religious man is as well fortified against temptation as is his fair sister, and in honor, fortitude, gentleness and mercy testifies to the uplifting influence which makes him fearless of men and fearful of God.

But in this age the sexes are not equally influenced by Religion. The men are neither as pious or as religious as the women. As a rule they do not attend divine services, they do not pray or worship in public or private. So engrossed are they by the cares of business that they devote no time or thought to the relations between themselves and their Creator. If they affiliate with churches it is too often in a perfunctory way and because it is still regarded as good form. Not only is this all true, but beyond this is the deplorable fact that men commonly sneer at religion and deride it as a lot of superstitious humbug, fit only for women and children. And strangely enough they as a rule are quite content to subject their women and children to the very humbug which they regard as noxious.

On the other hand if the women of this age are not as a rule religious, they are not indifferent to or contemptuous of it. They do not decry it or speak of it save with respectful defer-

ence. They frequently if not regularly attend worship, and almost unfailingly bring themselves in touch with their Maker by prayer.

If these premises be correct, the relative virtues of the sexes will indicate if not measure the power of Religion. To that power, working for the glorification of God and the betterment of mankind, let Woman witness.

Recur to the commandments and compare our women with our men. She, as a rule, is devout. She does not blaspheme. She does not commit deeds of violence. She does not bear false witness. She is honest. She is chaste. She is a good daughter, a faithful wife, a self-sacrificing mother. She is compassionate and merciful. She softens pain and solaces grief. She delights in good deeds. With the graces of her heart she makes gentle what is savage in man and leads her offspring from what is debasing to what is pure. She is strong in her virtues and trusted on account thereof.

And what of the men? Can it be said of them that in like degree with women of the same social station, they are free of the sins and shortcomings which denote unrighteousness? Are they as clear in speech and thought, as truthful and honest in deeds, as loyal, as brave in suffering, as resigned in sorrow, as tender to the afflicted, as merciful to the downcast, as true to their domestic obligations?

Who can doubt the answer to such questions?

From every Judge on the Bench, from every officer of justice, from every minister of the gospel, from every observer and student of our civilization there must come the same testimony, that in morals, in the sweetness and light of human nature, our women are on a higher plane than our men.

Our women are in a measure free; our men are in a bondage self-imposed.

The exactions of a bizarre life, the pace that kills, the mad rush for wealth, the cringing to greater power and the oppression of weakness, are links in the chains with which the modern man has fettered himself. Manacled as he is, his nature shrivels

and hardens. He is becoming more and more mind and matter, and less and less, heart and soul.

That women partake in a measure of his sordid appetites and aspirations is not surprising. She could not escape altogether the corrupting and corroding influence of such association. That she has not become as bad as the men, is due only to the fact that she has kept at least a low light burning on the altar. From it she draws hope, courage and inspiration. By it she learns that there is something in life besides, and better than power, riches or fame. It teaches her humility instead of pride; deference instead of arrogance; resignation instead of revolt. There is for her more wealth in her Bible than in her bank book; more power in the love of friends than in the fear of enemies; more glory in an approving conscience than in the plaudits of the multitude.

It would be an exaggeration to claim all this for all or even the majority of women. The ideal is seldom attained and even those who strive hardest to attain it exhibit infirmities of character. But I do claim with confidence that the lofty ideals are appreciated, studied, aspired to and striven for with fidelity, persistency and success chiefly by those who are Religious. To this let woman witness.

And now what shall we deduce from the argument. The reciprocal influences exerted by the sexes on each other make for good and for evil. Doubtless the religious tendency of women exercises a salutary effect on men and conversely the worldliness of men operates to lower the tone of woman's finer nature. If men would but recognize the merits of Religion and refrain from assailing it, it would be less difficult for women to uphold it; if women would more aggressively stand for Religion, men would not only cease their assaults but would more generally come under its influence. If men wish to encourage the highest and best qualities of the wife, the mother, the daughter and the son, they must encourage these to be religious. If the women wish their husbands to be models for their sons and their sons to follow in the footsteps of worthy sires, they must lead them to prayer.

Now it is, as in the past it has been, the mission of women to lead their little ones to the altar, there to learn to know, to love and to obey their Creator. Let them also break down derision and contempt and by sweet persuasion lead their husbands and brothers too. Her power to do this will be denied or ridiculed. But what of that? Time was when men gravely disputed as to whether women had souls. Only in recent centuries has she been looked upon as anything but a superior chattel. She was not esteemed worthy to think on serious subjects or pursue bread-winning avocations. She has proven her power against tremendous odds. She will in the future continue to testify in her own behalf.

In the past she has struggled to make herself man's equal. She has in morals so far surpassed him, that her next great mission is to make man her equal. This is the demand upon her powers. That she is equal to the task I have no doubt she will give abundant testimony.

ADDRESS OF LEO N. LEVI AT THE LAYING OF THE CORNER STONE OF THE NEW JEWISH WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' HOME AT NEW ORLEANS, 1886.

My Friends:

We are making history today. We are performing the initial act in the erection of a structure that I trust, and confidently believe, will endure in strength and usefulness long after we shall have surrendered the burdens of this life, to assume the unknown responsibilities of another existence.

The history of an age can only be correctly written during the ages that follow when the pen of the historian is free from contemporary passion or bias. Our age can claim no immunity from the operation of this general and universally accepted rule. The true estimate of our time is in the future and we can only speculate on the verdict which will be rendered by the generations to follow us. What will that verdict be?

I am no pessimist, but I cannot overcome the conviction that mingled with the vast progress of our time, there will be found elements of retrogression and decay. We have seen, it is true, the invention of the steam engine, the telegraph, the improved printing press, the railroad and a thousand other contributors to man's comfort, but we must not be blind to the fact that we have also produced the most destructive agencies ever known and that their abuse is not subject to control. Moreover, if we have rapid transit and quick communication, free education and cheap literature, we have also increasing international complications, immense public expenditures, heavy taxation, popular discontent, agrarian agitation and the ever threatening commune.

If wealth has increased, it has become unhappily distributed as to make a few powerful and overbearing, while the multitude grown desperate in suffering, turn to anarchy as a relief from

a condition that they despair of otherwise alleviating. The historian who shall write of our times will overlook none of these factors and we may well fear the judgment they will induce. May it not be, that in our progress, we have held the torch of truth so close to nature's face that we have burned away her fairest features? But if there be much evil to chronicle there shall not be wanting material for bright pages in the narrative. In making up the history of ancient peoples, we rely not upon the written evidence of events, manners, thoughts and character, but we look as well to monuments, public buildings, architecture in its various forms, and to a vast number of other sources that silently but unerringly expound the truth. The pyramids of Egypt, the Acropolis at Athens, the Coliseum at Rome themselves speak history, in mute but impressive eloquence. The future will treat the present as we do the past, and I can fancy in the remote ages to come, when as the result of revolutions which we cannot now foresee, all the conditions of our present civilization have been radically changed, the historian will resort to such materials to make up his verdict on our times. My friends, we are building a monument that shall serve him and us in that hour.

If the gaudy palaces of the rich shall tell of vice and pleasure indulged at the price of human misery, there shall also be found with the impress of this age upon their crumbling and moss-covered walls unnumbered sanctuaries to speak of a charitable people, offering tribute to the God of mercy. Such monuments are everywhere among us. Throughout the length and breadth of this our common country eleemosynary institutions of every kind, richly endowed and ably conducted, uplift their sightly forms. Certainly not less so than in the past, is the spirit of selfishness prevalent among the people of this age. Perhaps by reason of the changed conditions of life, if that spirit has not grown, it has had freer play, but traveling alongside of it, and with unwearied step, is the liberal spirit which makes our charities munificient and the intelligent energy which makes them effective.

There seems to be a divine law of compensation which invests every man and every age with some saving virtue. Thus the darkness of the feudal ages is relieved by the brilliancy of that

extravagant, but admirable chivalry that alone saved Europe from absolute barbarism.

Ours is an age of selfish strife. The acquisition of wealth and power is the universal ambition and to gratify which the most questionable agencies are employed. To the philosophic or reflecting observer there would appear to be in progress a barbarous conflict among brothers, over an heritage ample for all if not wasted in struggle, but the din of the battle, fierce though it be, is not always heard. There are intervals when the combatants rest from the fatigue of the fray and a temporary silence falls upon the field. Then it is that the voice of the weak and suffering gains audience. Then it is that the divine elements of man become ascendant. Then it is that foemen cast down their arms and unite in succoring the distressed. This is the saving virtue of our time, and if the age of chivalry be dead indeed, it has left as a legacy this cherished truth, that the bravest heart to meet a foe, is soonest moved to pity.

My friends, we are making history today. The representatives of seven great commonwealths are here assembled to assist in the solemn ceremonies of this hour. The occupations of our daily lives, our individual cares, our enmities, our private interests, have all been laid aside, to the end that we might each share in the beginning of an asylum for those helpless ones whom we have volunteered to protect. Let us not be guilty of vainglorious boasting, but let us at the same time feel better and nobler in the reflection that herein we turn to the light the brightest side of human nature.

The nature of man is like unto the face of the earth. On the summit of the snow covered mountain, whose bleak and aspiring peak is shrouded in impenetrable mists; in the desert whose waterless wastes have no alternation for quiet save in the dismal cry of savage brutes; on the storm beaten bosom of the sea, there is sublimity but not beauty, but when gentle hills with verdant slope lead to greener vales, when valleys teem with birds and flowers, and the ocean heaves lazily under blue skies, we are moved to softer emotions, and so with man.

In cold selfishness, silent hate, or noisy passion man may be

grand; but he is only loveable in benevolence, justice and charity. It is to these phases of human nature, as exhibited in our times, that our contemporaries are erecting monuments in the shape of charitable institutions. It is to these phases of our natures that we are building this monument, and it is in that sense that I say we are making history today. But, my friends, we are making history not only as contemporaries, not only as Americans, not only as Southerners, but as members of that wonderful tribe of Israel whose crown of glory is its mission to endure with patience and by sufferance to teach the word of God. We are making history as component parts of the American Jews, whose wandering and blistered feet have found a hospitable welcome here, where the constitution of a free and enlightened people guaranteeing equal rights to all men before the law, touches and exalts the persecuted heart like a divine benediction.

When the solid structure that we are about to erect along with all surroundings shall lie crumbling prostrate before the great destroyer, when moss and ivy shall bandage the unsightly wound that time has made and the curious traveler shall brush aside the vine and chase the lurking serpent from this stone, what emotions shall be aroused in his bosom? Shall he not stand in amazement to muse over that ever recurring and never answered problem of the Jew? Let us today as befitting this occasion, briefly consider what shall perhaps pass in review before him.

For centuries the Jews have endured in Europe and Asia a series of persecutions unparalleled in the history of any other people and which no other people could have survived. From peasant to sovereign the Gentiles courted the favor of heaven by the oppression of a devoted race and cruelty to the helpless Jew was offered up as a virtuous tribute to the God that Israel gave them. By the laws of almost every nation, by the customs almost of every country, by the prejudices of every class, they were made to wear the badge of inferiority, until the degradation heaped upon them became an assimilated, but unnatural element of their character. In Ghettos and Judengassen, in the lowest walks of life to which they were confined, the plastic but indestructible nature of the Jew partook of its environment, so that when the

nineteenth century civilization sought to invest him with social and political liberty, he was apparently unfitted to receive it. Nor were they offered, save in a niggard spirit, by any but the young nation, one irrefragable support of whose greatness is the unrestricted right of worship according to the dictates of our own conscience. The Jews along with other suffering people responded to invitation offered by America. From Europe mainly and largely within the past two generations there has been an influx of Jews to our American shores, so that today about five per cent of the Jews in the world acknowledge and pay allegiance to the Stars and Stripes.

In the nature of things, the immigrants, while to a large extent composed of adventurers, rather than desperate spirits, were in the main made up of the most needy, illiterate, unpolished and unsavory classes. Those who possessed a respectable measure of comfort at home, rarely, if ever, sought enlarged privileges in a distant country where the language, customs and laws were all strange. There are today about 300,000 Jews in the United States, composed almost exclusively of such immigrants as I have described and their descendants within the third generation.

What should be the status of this people today? Has this country done wisely to invite the scum of Europe and Asia to infest this land and madly riot in the privileges here extended? Has the result justified the experiment of the general invitation extended by the United States to the peoples of the world which has borne such a variety of fruit? The refuge offered to the persecuted and down-trodden has also been utilized by the scum of Europe and Asia and the conservative mind is filled with misgivings as to the result. The fathers of our country projected an experiment in liberty, the wisdom of which may well be doubted in the light of its development. I do not, however, propose to discuss that question here, and I only mention it, in order that I may consider it in relation to our own people. If others have imposed tyranny by virtue of the power derived of liberties enjoyed, no such charge can be laid at our doors.

The Jews have accepted freedom in good faith and for them I say the privileges extended have not been abused. For them I

dare to say, to the amazement of a wondering world, here under a beneficent government, we have risen in two generations from appalling degradation to the full stature of American manhood. I speak advisedly of the amazement of the world. Where can any history, save perhaps that of our people, point to another case of a down-trodden, persecuted, reviled and debased people who have risen so speedily from the slime of the marsh to the pure atmosphere of the hill tops? But perchance it will be said, I claim too much; that zeal has carried me to extravagance, the alluring ante-room of falsehood. Let us therefore briefly canvass the evidence:

The Jews came here poor; they have grown rich. They were illiterate; today their children and grandchildren flock to the highest seats of learning and bear away honors awarded to merit. They were uncultured, niggard and rude; today they build stately houses and fill them with rarest works of art. They came as peddlers, butchers and swineherds; today they follow every profession and vocation with credit.

They were indifferent to the government and its institutions; today they are patriots, and above all and what is most germain to this occasion, they take from their substance with unmeasuring hand and bestow it in intelligent charity.

The truth of all these claims is so apparent that "he who runs may read." It will be profitable, however, to examine somewhat more closely into the charities of our people, and I ask your indulgence while I present a few eloquent figures.

This is but a passing summary of the record and yet it speaks a volume. No achievements in peace or war can testify so eloquently to a people's virtue as the charities they accomplish. Nor have our charities, as we have seen, been confined to our own people. In every hamlet and metropolis when calamity of public or private nature is called to popular attention, the Jew is ever ready and foremost with his contribution. As the flower expresses in perfume its gratitude for fresh air and nourishing sunshine, so the Israelite voices his thanks for freedom in the charity he bestows. And could our grateful hearts find sweeter utterance than in the "mercy which blesses him that gives as well as him that receives?"

It is by our progress, our culture, our education, our obedience to law, our probity and above all by our good works that we are discharging our debt to the country which has enabled us to develop our natures, and I rejoice in it, both as a Jew and as an American. I rejoice in the conviction that were Columbia to call the roll of her adopted children and sternly demand which of them have requited her motherly protection and love, the Jew could step forward bearing the prints of industry and charity in his arms and proudly answer, "I."

It would tax your patience too heavily to discuss at length the causes which underlie this phenomenal development. Volumes have been written to explain why in all climes and under all circumstances the Jews have adapted themselves to their environment, without surrendering that mysterious quality which preserves their identity as Jews and as such pushes them ever to the front.

There is something in the Jewish character which may not be defined for it is divine. The lamp that burns forever in the heart of Israel radiates the light of God. Mixed with all the grosser elements of our nature is that undying and fundamental principle of our faith, "love thy neighbor as thyself." Even the rude savages that fitfully followed Moses were ripe for this grand idea and the seed planted in the breasts of those newly emancipated slaves has never perished. As Hillel said to the heathen, "What is evil unto thee do not to others." This is Judaism; the rest is all commentary.

Is it extravagant to claim that the mission of our race to preserve and promulgate this principle of love throughout all time, is the key to the problem of our history? The love of our fellowmen, the spirit of charity in its broadest sense, is at once the Jewish sustenance and rule of action. So long as it governs us it will sustain us, and thank God the evidence multiplies daily to the fact that the end is not yet.

Whenever the field is white unto the harvest the Jew is at work. Whenever sorrow wails and suffering appeals, the Jew is at hand to answer and to aid. Shall it not be always so? Shall the arms that have borne so much give way to burdens

now? Shall the spirit that braved the persecutions of centuries quail before the light of long deferred enfranchisement? Shall the sacred birthright of Israel consecrated again and again by martyrdom, be bartered away at last? Believe it not. The lamp whose flame is divine will never be extinguished. The future is richer than the past. The past is freighted with our achievements; the future is full of new duties from which we shall not shrink. The record we have made is but an earnest of what we shall do and in our modest way we here are doing our part to that end.

Enjoying the fullest liberty ever offered by any national government; untrammeled by tyrannical and debasing restrictions; with free air for aspiration, and the right under heaven to elevate our natures to the divine ideal, we shall requite the privileges we enjoy by the good which we accomplish. If we reap in fields of plenty, there shall be left for the gleaners who follow in the harvesters' path, the tithe that belongs to the poor. Let this asylum in some measure support the promise we thus make. Let us not only build it, but conduct it on such humane and intelligent principles that it may be said in our midst as it may be said wherever the Jews are suffered to prosper, that the distress of the poor is the care of every Jewish heart. We must not, we shall not falter in this mission, my friends. Our hearts are in it and our arms will be strong for the task. Here will we shelter and protect the widow, here will we shelter and educate the orphan and may I not say for you and all of us to the widows and orphans of this, our country, "though you drop tears as fast as the Arabian trees their medicinable gum," yet shall you be comforted. Though your wound be as deep as the limits of your hearts, they shall be healed, for the providence of the Lord shall lend the music of consolation to our words and soften the touch of our hands as we rest them in love upon your afflicted heads.

Such, my friends, be the proclamation that we issue today, and let it be so verified by our deeds that the afflicted shall echo and re-echo again the time-honored prayer of our people, "Blessed be the name of the Lord, for His mercy endureth forever."

A LAYMAN'S OPEN LETTER TO THE RABBIS.

Reverend Sirs:

In great perplexity of mind and to the end that I may be enlightened, I appeal to you. I am advised by my investigations that it is a traditional right and duty of the Jews to obtain instruction from the rabbis upon any and all matters pertaining to Judaism. It is in the exercise of that right and in the performance of that duty that I now address you. I have chosen to correspond with you thus publicly, in order that those who are perturbed like me, may have their embarrassments made known by what I propound and removed if possible by what you respond.

I am an American born Jew, desirous of maintaining the Jewish religion and my adherence thereto. I look with alarm upon anything which impels the American Jew to a position that may lead to his separation from Judaism. I have earnestly watched the progress of Jewish affairs in this country and I am so bewildered by their complexity that I am unable without your gracious aid to determine my own position.

In this dilemma I am not alone. I have conferred with my fellows in respect of my own perplexities, and I discover that not less blindly than myself do they grope in the darkness. I can not undertake to detail all the circumstances which have produced this unhappy mental state. I must content myself with the statement of a few outlines and leave to your fecund and discriminating intelligence the elaboration of the details.

I have been taught that Judaism is a religion teaching certain doctrines and the practice of certain duties. I have been taught that the better to accomplish such instruction and practice, certain ceremonies of more or less antiquity were observed. I have been taught that mere forms and ceremonies had been modified, increased or abolished from time to time by proper authorities to meet the requirements of the ages in which such changes occurred, but I have also been taught that the doctrines and

principles of Judaism in their purity, were of divine origin and not subject to be altered. In other words I have been led to believe that Judaism was an independent existence; a fact independent of what men thought about it; a religion in short that has a definition by which it may be identified without reference to the people who profess it. I have been taught that Judaism is a religion which Jews or anyone else might profess and that it is not merely a conglomeration of the doctrines which members of the Jewish race profess. I have always understood that if a born Jew accepts the divinity of Christ he becomes from a religious standpoint a Christian, and e converso, if a born Christian rejects Christ and adopts the doctrines of Judaism he becomes from a religious standpoint a Jew. Have I been properly instructed? I anticipate an affirmative reply, for that I was instructed by members of your calling. Being thus instructed, behold what difficulties beset me, when having arrived at man's estate, I make observations on my own account.

I observe that about three hundred rabbis presumably minister to the spiritual wants of the Jews in America. I observe that Judaism is professed in and avowedly taught from about three hundred pulpits in this blessed land of liberty. But alas! I also observe that what is termed Judaism in one synagogue is denounced as heresy in others and that when I seek to test the true Judaism in order to repudiate the false, I discover that you do not agree among yourselves. If I had but one of your number to appeal to, I could doubtless obtain ex cathedra satisfactory responses to all my queries, for I should ask no questions that I myself could answer, and I would be unable to dispute or doubt the correctness of those called for; but your number is legion! You are presumably all ordained and duly qualified as teachers of Israel; none of you has authority over the rest. You are co-ordinate and co-equal, and hence when you differ among yourselves, to whom shall I apply? Nor are your differences trivial. There is the general schism between the orthodox and the reformers, and among the reformers almost as many distinct doctrines as there are rabbis. In this diversity of views, I might look for the "common tie" in the race idea, but behold, a convoca-

tion of rabbis has declared that the Jews are no longer a race, but only a "religious community." If this be true then the Jews have a common religion, and that religion is Judaism. But the questions recurs, what is Judaism? And then again begins the differences between yourselves. I am patient myself and will labor long and earnestly for the truth, but it grieves me sorely to observe so many of my fellows exclaim "a plague on all your houses" and turn away from the fold entirely.

Perchance I do you wrong when I attribute the prevailing religious differences to the want of uniformity in your teaching, but I think not.

I have sought diligently and impartially for the causes that underlie the present condition of affairs, and governed as I am by the kindest feeling for your sacred calling, I am constrained to believe that if all our rabbis were agreed to teach what they all agreed was Judaism all the Jews would know what Judaism meant, and as in other countries would observe it. Believe me, when I assure you that I am far more charitable in my judgment of the rabbis in American than the vast bulk of my co-religionists. I hear every day the charge made by Jews that not only do the rabbis preach a distorted and false Judaism, but that they do not believe even the little which they preach.

I hear it charged that what you teach the Jewish children in the Sabbath schools, and what they profess as your teachings on Shebuoth is not the doctrine which you believe in your "heart of hearts."

And when I have indignantly protested against this charge of base hypocrisy on your part and ask how such facts as charged can be reconciled with your calling, I am answered that many of you are "rabbis for revenue only." It is said that many of you teach what your congregations like to hear, rather than what it is proper for them to know.

It is charged that many of you eschew sermons altogether and lecture upon social, political, literary and philosophical subjects, in order to avoid all questions of doctrine. Finally against some of you the indictment is made that you employ your position in Jewish pulpits to assail before Jewish congregations, the most

sacred doctrines of Judaism, not even sparing the *Torah* itself. "Can such things be?"

I asked one of your number once if he could reconcile a repudiation of the verity of the Old Testament with Judaism. "My dear friend," said he, "would you have me preach what I do not believe? Would you have me teach the truth of the testament when as an educated man I know it is not true?" I answered him as a friend, that I would not countenance hypocrisy nor restrict in any manner the liberty of thought or speech, but that there is a time and a place for all things. I conceived it then as I do now that the duty of every man is to teach the truth as he believes it, but if truth as he understands it, is in conflict with Judaism, a synagogue should not be chosen to preach it.

It is an insult to decency for any man to accept the position of rabbi and retain it as such, and in a Jewish pulpit to assail Judaism to a congregation of Jews. It were as proper for a Catholic priest to preach Judaism in a cathedral. I advised my friend to be a man and resign his place. I advise all rabbis who are not Jews to do likewise. A few have done this, and as free lances preach what they list. I may not, nay, do not, admire their teachings, but I admire their manhood which prompted them to withdraw from connection with a church that they were unwilling to undermine while paid to support it. Pray tell me, am I not right? Do you blame me? I trust not, but if you do censure me, give me the benefit of your reasoning, so that I may feel even more charity for those rabbis whom I have observed to teach anti-Jewish doctrines from a Jewish pulpit. They have not resigned.

If all the charges which I have stated be false then they should be emphatically denied by every one of you. Nay! if any of them be false, in so far, they should be negatived.

But you ask me, what is it that you wish? Wait! Let me show you some of the effects of the Jewish revolution in America.

On June 3d, 1887, in a prominent Jewish periodical, there appeared without comment by the editor, a sermon on the Jews, preached by W. H. Campbell, in the Congregational church at Carthage, Mo., on October 10th, 1886. In the course of the sermon the following significant language was used:

"The strict requirements of the old orthodox party is becoming a thing to be talked about in our Jewish families. While they do not look with approbation upon the marriage of their children with Gentile families, yet their family education is such as to open the gates for such marriages. In the last few years three such marriages have fallen under my own observation. A few years ago the daughter of Rabbi Wise, of Cincinnati, one of the leading Jewish teachers of this country, editor of one of their papers, actually abandoned her home and married a Roman Catholic. This simply shows the drift of the Jewish tendencies. It shows us that invincible rampart of Judaic exclusiveness is giving way, and that they with all the people of the earth, may yet be reached and moulded by the blessed gospel of the Nazarene.

"The Jew lives today in the declining shadow of his father's religion. He still disbelieves in the divinity of Jesus, but he is abandoning the 'traditions of the elders' and placing himself on the broad ground of agnostic or rationalistic disbelief in all religion, where in common with the thousands of our countrymen he may be reached by the Church of God."

The writer has been deeply impressed by the circumstances which provoked, if they do not warrant such expressions.

But a few days since I had occasion to confer with a gentleman in respect of matters affecting Jewish affairs. In the course of the conference, I appealed to him for aid in the construction of a Jewish synagogue. He declined on the ground that there was no reason why he should contribute for such a purpose, for, said he: "I am a Jew only by the accident of birth. It is true," he continued, "I don't believe in Christianity, neither am I an atheist, but in that I don't believe in the inspiration or verity of the Old Testament, nor in the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish religion, I can not consider myself as a Jew, otherwise than as a member of the race, and for that fact I am in no wise responsible."

Recently in one of our largest cities, a gentleman of prominence and ability delivered a so-called lay-sermon, in which it was proposed to set forth the religious views of the American Jews. In this lay-sermon, the lecturer denounced as obsolete doc-

trines some of the most important and cardinal tenets of the Jewish faith.

I could continue the recital of facts and occurrences which give prominence and imminence to the question agitating my mind and the minds of others viz.: "Is this so-called reform movement in America merely an intelligent and conservative movement designed and calculated to preserve Judaism by ridding it of mere trivial forms and ceremonies instituted by rabbis in a former age, or is it a revolution affecting doctrines and principles which if allowed to ripen will separate the Jews in America from Judaism and make them easy prey for other denominations?"

Has this question not occurred to you? The Rev. W. H. Campbell has evidently considered it. The American born Jew is considering it, and moreover he proposes to have an answer to it. It is not easy to solve the problem, because we have no common *locus standi*, except that we want to preserve Judaism. Having reached thus far the old question recurs: What is Judaism? I read and you do, in the public prints, sermon after sermon in reply to the thread-bare question, *Why am I a Jew?* The question is monotonously uniform, but the replies are only uniform in that they all disagree one with the other. In view of such a state of affairs I deem it small wonder that my fellows exclaim "A plague on all your houses."

Let us ponder boldly; 'tis a base abandonment of reason to resign the right of thought. My reverend friends, wax not wroth at these questionings. Do not discard them with a sneer of contempt. Do not deride the presumption of laymen who question your motives or deeds. Remember that you claim the right to probe into the motives and deeds of Moses. Nay of Israel's God himself. Shall you be exempt? Shall we not question? With such examples before them, you must be patient when the people doubt you, and ask an account at your hands.

We want light. There is a chaotic condition of affairs now existent than precludes an intelligent selection of our course. Tell us, what is Judaism?

When the mariner has been tossed for many days in thick

weather on an unknown sea, he naturally avails himself of the first pause in the storm, the earliest glance of the sun, to take his latitude and ascertain how far the elements have driven him from his true course. Let us imitate this prudence and before we float farther, refer to the point from which we departed, that we may at least be able to conjecture where we now are.

To that end I beg particularly to propound certain interrogatories, to which I most respectfully pray for replies either in the pulpit or the press.

I ask these questions in no captious spirit, and I sincerely trust that each of you will regard them as entirely proper to be asked and necessary to be answered.

1st. Is Judaism a religion that may be defined so that it can be distinguished by its elements from all other creeds, or is it simply any system of doctrines professed by Jews?

2d. If it be a religion *per se,* are its fundamental doctrines and principles of divine or human origin?

3d. If it be simply the doctrines maintained by the Jews, then state what is Judaism when the Jews do not all believe alike. Will the creed of the majority be entitled to the name?

4th. If you answer yea, to the foregoing interrogatory, state if the few hundred thousand reformed Jews have not moved without the pale of Judaism.

5th. If on the other hand you answer that Judaism is a religion *per se* then state if its cardinal, fundamental and distinctive doctrines are not of ancient origin, whether human or divine.

6th. Being ancient and well defined, and giving character to the religion, are these doctrines and principles the proper subject matter of change and if so by whom may they be altered?

7th. Who is invested with the authority to make any change in principles and doctrines as maintained aforetime and whence was that authority derived?

8th. If you answer that *reason* is the authority, then state who shall test the quality of the *reason,* and whether if *reason* conflicts with Judaism, it may be substituted for and take the name of Judaism.

9th. Was *Maimonides* a Jew, and did he or not know what Judaism was, as taught in the Old Testament?

10th. Is the Old Testament the proper source whence to derive the truths and essentials of Judaism?

11th. Is the Old Testament true?

12th. Is the Old Testament an inspired book, or only the work of human hands?

13th. Did *Maimonides* correctly state the doctrines of Judaism in his thirteen articles? If not, in what particular did he err?

14th. Is it true that the rabbis in America are not in accord in their conceptions or definitions of Judaism?

15th. Is it true that many rabbis preach what they do not believe?

16th. Is it true that many rabbis believe that which they know conflicts with Judaism and hence do not preach it?

17th. Is it true that many rabbis are rationalists, pantheists, agnostics, materialists or skeptics? Do you belong to any of these classes?

18th. Do you believe in a personal god?

19th. Do you believe in the efficacy of prayer? That is to say, do you believe that God hears and either grants or refuses the prayers that we utter?

20th. Do you believe that Israel has the divine mission to teach God's word?

21st. Do you believe in revelation as narrated in the Old Testament?

22d. Do you believe in the sanctity of the Sabbath as a God ordained holiday?

23d. Do you believe that a religious obligation rests upon the Jews to practice the rite of circumcision?

24th. Do you believe that the Jews are simply a religious community or a race of people with a divine mission?

25th. Do you believe that there exists any material difference between Judaism and any other religion which teaches simply a pure monotheism and morality?

26th. What are the distinctive and essential elements of Judaism?

27th. If anyone does not believe in them does he not cease to be a Jew from a religious standpoint?

28th. Do you believe in them?

29th. Do you believe in anything that makes your belief in Judaism impossible?

30th. Have you defined Judaism as you would have it, or as it is?

In conclusion let me again urge you not to ignore this appeal. It will not go unnoticed. The inquiring mind must be satisfied, and unless you desire to encourage the prevailing indifference and hasten the hour when we "shall sit in the shadow of our fathers' declining religion," you will give earnest heed to the problems presented above. "Under which King Benzonian? Speak or die."

Awaiting your prompt and favorable consideration of my great dilemma, I remain,

Your Most Obedient and Respectful Servant.

THE JEWS OF TODAY IN AMERICA.

Address delivered at Memphis, Tenn., 1884.

Some years ago a distinguished Rabbi in my presence predicted the early decline and fall of Judaism, and the Jews. His gloomy views were based upon the fact that among those Jews who were not indifferent to their religion, there was discord operating to bring about ruin.

So far from agreeing with him, I ventured to prophesy that in the American-born Jew would be found a force not only to perpetuate the Jewish religion, but to endow Jewish social and communal life with such dignity and virtue as would add new luster to our history. It is not yet timely to claim that my forecast was correct, but unless I am mistaken in the trend of the hearts and minds of the young American Jews it was not without warrant.

It is not to be gainsaid that in every direction we find affluent, educated and talented young men who chafe under certain social limitations; who sneer at their race and religion, and who, with ostentation, manifest not only indifference to, but contempt for, both. But to a great extent these are governed rather by self-glorification, than any deep-seated aversion to Jews or Judaism, and beneath the thin veneer of such self-worship, there abides an ineradicable, although suppressed, devotion to the traditions and duties, if not to the doctrines, of our race.

The Jew, while lamenting, loves the restrictions that environ him. The scars of conflict, although disfiguring and fraught with pain, are ever the sources of pride and the objects of affection to him who wears them. And so the Jew, who perforce recognizes the limitations which surround him as the evidences of his long and heroic struggle with relentless foes, in his innermost heart loves those limitations for the story they tell.

For all this, there are doubtless many of our young men who are so far dissatisfied with their race and religion that they wish to separate themselves from the one and to throw off the other. But if there be among us some weaklings who ostensibly or actually seek to kick over the ladder by which they have ascended; who would destroy the family Bible because in its pages is to be found the family religion, and on its fly leaves the family pedigree, it is undeniably true that the great majority of our youths are loyal to their people and to the essential principles of the ancestral faith.

There are wide differences between the Jews born in America and the foreign fathers who begot them. The thrift, industry, fortitude and domestic virtues which distinguished the father appear in a lesser degree in the son, but in the latter, in a greater degree, are to be found a liberal education, the graces of refined society and the pride engendered by an atmosphere of religious and political freedom. The father spent his youth under conditions that naturally narrowed his point of view. Everywhere for him was constraint. Even the study of his religion was conducted under iron rules, and the observance of them enforced with such rigor that no latitude was allowed for expansion of thought. When he departed from his native home and established himself in free America, it was entirely natural that the restraints which obtained on the other side of the Atlantic should be thrown off without moderation. Not equipped by education to make nice distinctions, and accustomed to the mechanical observance of religious ceremonies, there had come to exist in his mind a confusion between the spirit and the forms of the religion. When, in the enjoyment of the new-found liberty, some of the forms which had been regarded as sacred, were no longer observed, in a spirit of bravado, others were set aside, and finally, to a large extent, a derision of the religion took the place of its former slavish observance. The acquisition of wealth intensified the disposition to set aside the religion. It would be unjust to say that Mammon had been set up to be worshiped, but it would be less than the truth if I should fail to say that in many cases the eager quest for gold had become so absorbing that neither time

nor inclination was left for the religious life. But with the offspring of these emigrants the conditions were different. They grew up in an atmosphere of liberty. No restrictions of any kind were imposed upon them. They were not driven to hardship and suffering by the lash of poverty. They were not debarred the privileges of education, but, on the contrary, wherever talent manifested itself in a youth he was urged, not only by his own inclination, but by his elders, to develop such talent and to follow some learned profession. And so we find that while less than three-quarters of a century have passed since any considerable settlement of Jews in the United States, the walks of every learned profession and every avenue of art and science are frequented by Jews, who almost invariably have forged to the front rank. These young men, if compared with their fathers, are lamentably ignorant of the religion and history of their race. They have devoted no time to that study of the law and commentaries thereon which is regarded in Europe as the crown of glory, but they have not remained altogether uninformed, and the larger outlines of Jewish history and the essential elements of the Jewish faith have found lodgment in their minds. If they be Americans, more than Jews, their very Americanism makes them bold in respect of their Jewish lineage. The courage and chivalry which they prize as Americans make them cling with tenacity to the fortunes of their people, and if this seems to operate at times to their detriment they face the situation without quailing. They are Americans with all of the American assertiveness, pushing, jostling and rushing through life, giving and taking blows with courage and good humor, striking better because they are Americans and enduring better because they are Jews. And to such men to whom the intellectual life was a choice, the religious life becomes a necessity.

The barrenness of materialism fails to satisfy the aspirations of expanded souls, and they seek, not in musty books nor in cabalistic characters, for their faith, but in open volumes which tell in plain and simple language those essential truths, concerning which there can be but little dispute. They are discontented with existing conditions. Philosophy is unacceptable as a sub-

stitute for religion and as yet they are groping for a religion which satisfies. On the one hand they reject a ritualism which overshadows righteousness, and on the other, new departures which destroy devotion. But the worshipful leaven is at work within them and will cause them to follow Abraham who destroyed the idols in his father's house, and upon the sands of the Chaldean desert found and communed with God.

This religious spirit is, however, of recent birth; indeed, it may be characterized as embryonic. It has taken neither shape nor form; it has set up no dogmas or creeds; it is simply an aspiration after the truth, not so heavily covered as to be suffocated, or so naked as to be frozen. But it manifests itself as all true religious fervor does, in a yearning to serve the Almighty through service to mankind.

This development of a religious spirit is not new in the history of the world; indeed, I think I may safely say that the substratum of all religion consists of the love which man bears to his fellow-man. Upon this foundation he builds upward until he has an adequate conception of the relation between himself and his Creator.

The aspirations to which I have referred have developed and are developing energies that are daily seeking subjects upon which to operate. And these latter are not wanting. To the young men and the young women of our race in this country are coming problems, some arising from new conditions, and others handed down by the short-comings, or short-sightedness of the preceding generation. These problems are pressing and numerous. I shall not attempt to advert to all of them, but those which I shall mention will doubtless suggest others that are of no less importance.

It is only within the past two decades that we have had such an influx of ignorant and poverty-stricken co-religionists as to make their presence in this country a matter for serious reflection. Prior to the recent persecutions of the Jews in Russia and the Balkan provinces, the emigration to this country from Europe was gradual and voluntary, and those who came were able, by unaided efforts or the assistance of relatives and friends, to estab-

lish themselves firmly and safely in their new homes. Their prosperity came rapidly; suffering and poverty were rare, and out of the exuberance of charity the prosperous made provision for the poor and the suffering without any careful study of the proper bounds and exercise of benevolence.

Such organizations as were created were at first altogether local, and based upon unpretentious European models. Aside from the benefactions thus administered, individuals not only contributed to every applicant for alms, but sought out deserving cases of want for the pleasure of alleviating the distress thus discovered. It goes without saying that even in small communities great impositions were practiced, but those who were imposed upon contented themselves with the reflection that it was better to give to ninety-nine unworthy beggars than to refuse one who was really deserving. This superficial view has been the prolific mother of many mischiefs in philanthropic work.

A moment's reflection should convince any one that it is not sufficient to have the charitable impulse and follow it by benefactions, but that it is also necessary to regard charity as a duty, the performance of which challenges the highest intelligence, firmness and wisdom. The bestowal of alms upon the unworthy is a corresponding denial to the deserving.

As the Jewish population of the United States increased the philanthropic work that demanded attention overtaxed the powers of local organizations. In the larger cities eleemosynary institutions were established undertaking to provide for helpless and deserving persons, for the care of whom the benevolent societies were incompetent. It would be difficult to overestimate the enthusiasm exhibited in the formation and the conduct of such institutions. Local pride was inflamed and, especially among the wealthy, was there a generous rivalry in the amount of contributions offered for the establishment and maintenance of these various asylums for the poor. Men of more or less capacity volunteered their time and attention, as well as their money, and their efforts and their sacrifices were rewarded by the applause, not only of local communities but of our people in all parts of the country. The distinction thus bestowed upon the managers of

organized charities stimulated the founding of others in which like distinctions were sought. A somewhat too rapid multiplication was the natural result. It was not deemed necessary to study whether or not a new charity was demanded or whether one was more deserving than another. It was sufficient that what was projected was good in itself, and that the means to carry it out were forthcoming, either as the result of voluntary contributions or such as were obtained by personal solicitation on the part of those whose pride was enlisted to achieve success. This success was estimated by the amount of contributions obtained, and the manner in which they were employed. Costly and beautiful edifices were erected, furnished with every comfort, and, I might say, almost every luxury that ingenuity could suggest or money provide, and a rivalry sprung up between the different institutions in which each sought to do better than the other by the objects of their bounty. Those who were charged with the management of a particular charity as a rule became so engrossed in the work that they would devote little, if any, attention to other benefactions, and in many instances, personal influence operated so strongly in favor of one that others were unintentionally impeded.

To not a little extent this condition prevails at the present time. In some communities, men, actuated by a charitable spirit that is more emotional than wise, or, in rarer cases, by personal ambition, have called into being organizations which compete, so to speak, with others, and exploit our people to such an extent that their abilities to contribute are overtaxed. So long as the Jewish public was able to provide for all of these benefactions, without stopping to inquire which were the more deserving, the evils referred to were not and could not be obvious.

But since there have come to our shores needy and ignorant co-religionists equal in number, perhaps, to those who had, prior to twenty years ago, successfully established themselves in these United States, the ratio of those who need help to those able to extend it, has risen so high that it becomes imperatively necessary to halt and take our bearings in philanthropic matters.

No efforts are required to arouse in the Jewish heart a char-

itable emotion—it has always found an abiding place there; and if anything, it is too impulsive in answering the appeal of the suffering. What is necessary is to educate the Jewish mind to a proper understanding of our duty in respect of those who require our assistance. It is requisite to teach anew what has always been a doctrine of the Jewish church, that charity is simple justice, and that as such it must be bestowed, not indiscriminately but intelligently. The individual must be taught that ordinarily the direct bestowal of alms upon the mendicant is an unwise, and, therefore, an unjust depletion of the ability of the alms-giver. Whatever the individual has to bestow in charity belongs not to him but to the deserving poor. He is but a trustee. The fund is a trust-fund in his hands in the disposition of which he should take no chances, for the consequences of a mistake do not fall upon him but upon the poor. Moreover, such haphazard and undiscriminating charity offers a premium to the indolent to forsake the paths of industry and rely upon alms for sustenance. The time has arrived when we must deal with our needy from a scientific standpoint. When we have measured our ability to contribute to charitable work, we must see to it that our contributions achieve the best results.

This can be done only through organizations administered with the highest wisdom and without regard to personal ambition, or the pleasure derived therefrom by those charged with the administration. Moreover, it is not only necessary that each particular charity should be thus administered, but that each should be administered with reference to all the others, having in mind that the common object of all should be the well-being of all.

In every civilized government there are numerous departments, each necessary to carry out the functions of the government, but each so related to all the others that by the operation of all, if wisely conducted, the best results for the people can be secured. No government can be a success, in which a less important department is pampered at the expense of one that is more important. If the revenues of the government are devoted to perfecting one agency when another is more required, disaster

must surely result. To avoid such evils, at the beginning of each fiscal period the statesmen who conduct public affairs make a budget of the expected revenues and of the expenditures required. In the raising of revenues so as to create no unnecessary burdens, and in the effective distribution thereof in the public interest, is to be found the highest statesmanship.

After such a model should be created some system of philanthropy in this country among our people. It is not my purpose to formulate and declare a plan that will be effective to such an end. I do not arrogate to myself the ability to outline a scheme that would be satisfactory to others or even to myself, but if I can make it apparent that some comprehensive policy, possessing national as well as local features is required, I do not doubt that the means to achieve the same will be found in a multitude of counsel. I shall content myself with the simple statement of a few general principles, the correctness of which I know will not be challenged and the application of which to existing conditions can readily be made.

To begin with, a means should be found to obtain from every one, according to his capacity, contributions in effort and in money for the alleviation of suffering, and for war upon ignorance among our people. It is not sufficient that a few should give liberally. It is necessary that all should contribute justly and this is true, not only because the aggregation of many contributions of money and effort will be of greatest service to the poor and the ignorant, but because, what is almost equally important, it will be of such vast benefit to those who give. There can be no objection to great benefactions from the rich, but these must not excuse proportionately liberal benefactions from those in modest circumstances. Again, while great and occasional gifts should be encouraged, a steady revenue for charitable purposes should be more earnestly striven for. When it is ascertained, as it can be with proper organization, what sums in each locality and in the country at large, can be counted upon for philanthropic work, the best thought and study should be given to such a disposition of these revenues as will accomplish the greatest good where most urgently required. We are no longer in that happy condition

when our means are greater than the calls made on us; on the contrary, the demands for help far exceed our ability, and it behooves us to so manage that if any demand be left unanswered it shall be because one of a more pressing and deserving nature has been complied with. It is because no adequate provision has been heretofore made for such management that I find fault with the administration of our charities up to the present time, and it is in the hope mainly of reforms in the future that I venture the criticisms contained in these remarks.

Conditions would be ideal if among our people in this country there existed one great organization having universal support and so equipped that it could deal effectively, and in the first instance, with national matters, and in a supervisory capacity with district and local affairs. Such an organization in which each member would stand upon a parity with all the others, and in which the individual contribution to the general funds would be exceedingly small, would afford an opportunity to even the poor among us to add their means and their energies to philanthropic undertakings without lessening the opportunity or the impulse of those in better circumstances to supplement the general revenues with large occasional donations. Every member in such a society would naturally feel a direct interest in every charitable enterprise, which would not be left, as is largely now the case, in the hands of a minority in each community because of their personal popularity or their generous contributions. Moreover, at stated intervals, representatives of the members could and would meet in conference to consider, not only the ways and means of raising revenues, but what is equally important, the direction in which they should be expended, the rate of the expenditure and the preference, if any, that should be given to one work over another.

To carry out this idea it would not be necessary for existing or future orphan asylums, hospitals, homes for the aged, etc., to surrender their autonomy. It has been found that even in institutions founded and conducted by the B'nai B'rith and other orders, a large measure of independence is wisely conferred upon the management. But the occasion for establishing such asylums, the

order in which they should be called into existence, the general policy to be pursued in conducting them, the location of them and kindred questions, should be confided to parliaments, so to speak, in which large districts are represented and in which local pride and personal ambitions must yield to the general good.

A practical illustration of this thought is afforded in the Seventh District of the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith. The Jewish Widows' and Orphans' Home and the Touro Infirmary at New Orleans were established without reference to the B'nai B'rith. Both were originally more or less local in their operations. But in time each sheltered and ministered to the helpless and suffering from all the States composing the Seventh District. Local contributions were inadequate for the service required, and contributions from other communities were fitful and therefore unreliable. Under such circumstances the Home first, and the Infirmary next, sought sanction and support from the Seventh District. Both applications were granted. From the funds of the District each institution receives Two Dollars per annum for each member of the District. In return the District is given representation on the Board of Managers, is furnished regularity with all reports and in convention is afforded an opportunity to influence the policy and administration of these institutions. Every innovation of importance is submitttd to the Grand Lodge for approval. The annual consideration by the Grand Lodge of these charities has proven a wholesome and effective agency. Moreover, the close union between them and the Order has made it certain that no rivals will arise in the Seventh District until circumstances demand them. So accustomed are the people to rely upon the wisdom of their representatives in the Grand Lodge that if a new Orphans' Home or Hospital were proposed, an endorsement by the Grand Lodge would be a prerequisite of success.

Among the evils I am combatting I mention only a few: personal ambition, spite and vainglory too frequently give birth to organizations having a worthy object in view, but for which there is no pressing, if any, need, and the existence of which imperils the safety and effectiveness of others more deserving because

more requisite. It would be amusing, if the results were not so serious to contemplate the numerous associations in our larger cities, all working on practically independent lines, each pushed with energy and promoted with pride, and each, in a measure, impeding or impairing the good work of the others—not purposely, be it understood, but because each draws from the common stock of means and ability.

Think of a system, or want of system, if you like, of philanthropic work in which time, talent and money are expended to accomplish worthy, but not necessary, ends, and in which, for want of means, helpless children are allowed to grow up in need and ignorance, or, what is worse, to die for want of proper sustenance.

I have no desire to weary you with statistics, and candor compels me to say that I have no comprehensive and accurate statistics that I might employ on this occasion. I am warranted, however, in saying, from such investigations as I have been able to make, that in the larger cities, especially, not exceeding ten per cent of the Jewish population are regular contributors to organized charity. This testifies, most eloquently, to existing faults in raising revenues, and the straightened circumstances of our most deserving eleemosynary institutions prove how they suffer from the existence of the less deserving. It goes without saying that aside from the waste of energy and means involved in the conditions which I have named, there is necessarily an extravagance or want of economy in the multiplication of societies. In most all of these, salaries must be paid to executive officers, and other expenses incurred that could be avoided or curtailed by more comprehensive organization. I have in mind one association, national in its character, which, according to the official reports, expends one-fourth of its revenues in salaries. But yet another evil has grown up, and which would be corrected if these problems were studied scientifically and discussed along lines that took no account of personal ambitions or pride.

In our asylums and hospitals too much attention has been paid to art, beauty and luxury. There is too much pride in the beauty of the structures and their surroundings; in the cost of the buildings and the furnishings; in the high character of the

food and the service. The pleasure of exhibiting all these features to the glory of the management is not the least consideration in the conduct of affairs. For one I am constrained to find fault in those things which are generally esteemed virtues. When I say this, my criticism falls upon myself as well as upon any other, for until circumstances compelled me to reflect more deeply upon the subject, I, too, rejoiced over the magnificence with which our different charities were being conducted. But maturer reflection has convinced me that in philanthropic work the pride and glory of the philanthropist should be entirely subordinate to the well-being of the object of his bounty. It is not for our sake that we should give or do, but for the sake of those who stand in need, and doing and giving are duties to be performed as if we were paying a debt that might be rightfully claimed from us. If this be a correct proposition, it behooves us to inquire who are our creditors and what must be done in order to discharge the obligation. We shall not do our duty if we overpay one creditor and deny another altogether. We must be just as well as generous, and if we cannot be both, let us be just. Can we satisfy our conscience by taking one of a number of poverty-stricken proteges, and, as it were, rolling him in the lap of luxury while the others are left without any share, whatever, in our bounty? This is what is frequently, if not generally, done under the present want of system in the administration of Jewish benefactions.

I cannot undertake, within the limits of a single address, to go far into details. It will suffice, however, to illustrate my meaning, to deal even superficially with our orphan asylums. Everywhere our people look with pride and tenderness upon these shelters for the helpless ones who are denied parental protection. To me, as a rule, they are a reproach, not because those who contribute to them and administer to them are not actuated by the loftiest motives, but because in the genesis and careers of these institutions cetrain principles have been lost sight of, the non-observance of which have led to great wrong.

Let me refer to an official report which is by no means unique: In the Forty-first Annual Report of the Jewish Foster Home and Orphan Asylum of Philadelphia, issued in 1896, is to be found the

following language in the President's message: "For the first time in the history of this institution, a period now covering forty-one years, we have in the home 107 children, the largest number ever housed at any one time. The number, however, might, by this time, have been much larger if our income had warranted the additional expenditure. The applications continue as heretofore, among them many worthy cases, which we are compelled to either turn away or to put off until a vacancy occurs. While the Admission Committee is justified in this course, the members feel themselves much hampered in their work and great injustice is done to many worthy orphans. This state of affairs should no longer be permitted to exist in such a large community as Philadelphia, whose citizens have always supported every noble charity so liberally. We cannot permit our Jewish orphans to go to other denominations for support, and when such a case occurs it is immediately drawn to our attention and peremptory orders given that the children must be taken care of by us. Cases of this kind have occurred recently, and must occur again if we cannot provide for them."

In the report for 1897 of the Jewish Hospital Association of Philadelphia, it is stated that the Jewish population of Philadelphia is about 50,000, but the contributors to the Hospital number only 1,242. The regular contributors to the Orphan Asylum are not materially in excess of those to the Hospital. It will be observed from the report that for want of funds the Orphan Asylum has been compelled, habitually, to turn away worthy applicants for admission. Should this condition of affairs exist, even though no additional revenues can be obtained? These 107 children are housed in a palace; they are the recipients of donations of food, clothing, and a vast variety of comforts and luxury, the value of which is not charged as part of the expenses. And yet, without counting rent, which among the poor is always a very considerable item, it costs, in round figures, $200 per annum to maintain each of these orphans. If interest be computed upon the value of the Asylum. by way of rent, this per capita would be largely increased. Other things being equal, it is more economical to house, feed and clothe a large number of people under a single

organization than it would be to house, feed and clothe the same number of people separately or under smaller organizations.

The Cleveland Orphan Asylum in 1897 reported 500 orphans, with an annual expenditure of about $60,000, making the per capita expense $120 per annum as against $200 per annum at the smaller asylum in Philadelphia.

I think it safe to assume that the cost of maintaining an adult is ordinarily twice that of maintaining a child. An average family consists of man, wife and five children, or what would be the equivalent of nine children. At $200 per annum for each child, the expenses of an ordinary family would be $1,800 per annum; but in order to be on a parity with these asylums, such a family should have no rent to pay, no taxes to pay, no doctor's bills, and should receive many donations of clothing, fuel, food, transportation, etc., from day to day and almost daily. If the head of a family had a fixed income of $1,800 and house rent free, with immunity from taxes and doctor's bills, and should pose as an object of charity, he would be denounced as an unworthy creature. Indeed, under such favorable circumstances, he would be expected not only to support his family and rear his children in comfort, but even to make some small savings. I do not doubt that we have many among us on this occasion whose income does not exceed the sum I have mentioned and who from it must pay not only the expenses of maintenance that are properly chargeable against the orphans, but house rent and doctor's bills. Again, I find in some asylums that about $1,000 is employed permanently for the housing of each orphan. Applying this same ratio to an ordinary family, the poor man's home should be estimated at $9,000. But the per capita cost of housing 100 or 150 people in one building is relatively smaller than to house the same number of people in fifteen or twenty different buildings. It follows that if the ordinary family were housed and sheltered in the same style as is maintained in some of our orphan asylums, the poor man's home would be an exceedingly expensive affair. When such things stare us in the face, can we be satisfied with the statement that there are many orphans denied admission to our asylums because of want of funds? Do not wisdom and justice sug-

gest that we should adopt a different policy so as to materially reduce the per capita cost and increase the number of inmates? Moreover, leaving aside the question of cost, and assuming that our means are adequate to take care of all the deserving ones in the style which has been hitherto observed, is it well for the little ones that they should be reared in luxury, so to speak, and after a childhood passed under such circumstances, be launched out to fight the world with no resources? They may be well educated, well disciplined in morals and manners, but coming as they do from a little world of their own, in which there have been no storms and no trials, in which they have felt no sorrows and endured no hardships, in which they have learned no self-reliance nor cultivated any aggressiveness. in which every want has been filled for them by the kind and tender hands of others, they enter the world under the greatest disadvantages. They are like flowers that have been reared in a hot-house and suddenly compelled to endure the chill blasts of winter.

We need reform in the administration of our charitable organizations. We must seek to make them havens and not heavens, and as havens they should be broad enough and roomy enough to take in all who require shelter and sustenance, and to that end let the sustenance and shelter be so modest in quality and measured in quantity as to be sufficient and no more. This, in my humble judgment, will be charity of a loftier nature than to endow a few victims of misfortune with every comfort and luxury, while other equally deserving sufferers receive nothing but our sympathy.

Doubtless these criticisms will not be received on every hand in the same spirit in which they are uttered. We are all prone to object to fault-finding which is directed towards ourselves. I shall sincerely deplore any resentment engendered by my words. My criticisms have a great object in view and should be received with kindness. If I am correct the accused stand convicted of no greater offense than being too generous, and reforms will follow; if, on the other hand, I am wrong, it will be an easy matter to show my error. Let the subject be discussed calmly but earnestly. Let the statistics be gathered from other institutions, espe-

cially non-Jewish, and let comparisons be made. Such investigation will demonstrate, that if orphans be housed in cheap but healthful quarters, fed and clothed as befits people in humble circumstances, at least two can be reared for what it now costs us to rear one. If such a suggestion makes me appear harsh to the wards within our walls, let it be remembered that I am considerate of those without. If your eyes swim at the thought of curtailing the comforts now enjoyed by our proteges, I ask what of those who demand our protection and are wholly denied? He is not a good father who feeds a favored few of his children on dainties, while the others are permitted to go hungry.

If I have singled out our Orphan Asylums to comment upon it must not be understood that the objections raised apply to them alone. On the contrary, the objections obtain generally to our eleemosynary institutions. Happily our own Orphan Asylum at New Orleans is exempt from many of the criticisms I have uttered. No orphan has yet been denied admission to that refuge, but let us heed the experience of others and look far into the future. In the report of President Gabe Kahn, dated March 20, 1898, occurs this significant sentence: "The wants of our Home are constantly increasing; so is the population of this city and of the entire South, from which demands on our resources may be expected to come in ever-growing quantities."

But I may be asked to indicate somewhat more specifically than I have, how a practical remedy may be found for the evils to which I have adverted. In reply I would say that I have already pointed out that to the young men and to the young women among our people must be left the solution of these and kindred problems. I have also indicated that their work must be accomplished through organization. It remains to be considered whether a new organization is required. I think not.

We have one already that has been in existence for more than a half century, that is not only co-extensive with the limits of this country, but has established a firm foothold in Europe, Asia and Africa. It has a history of which it may be proud, and if in that history are to be found countless errors and failures, it must not

be forgotten that it has outlived them all and has survived by virtue of its inherent forces operating to good ends.

The Independent Order of B'nai B'rith does not derive universal support among the Jews. It is not fashionable. Like all organizations that are democratic and catholic in their make-up and operations, it has excited hostility in the breasts of those who are exclusive, and disposed to set themselves upon a plane higher than that occupied by the general mass of their fellows. It is further opposed because at times it has taken up work not calculated to arouse the loftiest sentiments and has occasionally been diverted from its best missions. Moreover, it has had among its leaders, from time to time, some men who were personally unpopular, or who employed the organization to promote selfish ambitions and finally, for want of better leadership it has, time and again, fallen into a state of inertia which indicated to the superficial observer that it had outlived its usefulness. That it has survived all these adversities should excite serious reflection in the minds of every Jew having at heart the future welfare of his people. This brotherhood, like all human organizations, is full of infirmities, but these are either accidental or incidental and not inherent, and underlying all and pervading all is a vital and enduring force which called it into being, and will perpetuate it as long as that principle is dear to our people. This vital and enduring force is philanthropy, not upon any narrow grounds, but upon the broadest principles of humanity—a philanthropy that looks to succoring the widow and the orphan, the poor and the needy, the helpless and the distressed; to encouraging science, literature and art, to elevating the mental and moral nature of our race. Such a platform is sound enough and broad enough to invite upon it every Jew without respect to the shade of his religious belief, the country of his nativity, his avocation in life, or his social station. The mission of the B'nai B'rith is not ended, nor will it be as long as grave problems confront our people. The first and most successful Jewish fraternal order will not perish from the earth, although it may lie dormant at times for lack of leaders among us quick to perceive the problems that beset us, and ready to labor for their solution.

Among the young men are to be found such leaders. I have an abiding faith that they will not only preserve what has been achieved but add new glories to the record made. They will not, in utter selfishness, deny themselves to their suffering brothers, or in utter folly hope to aid them without organization. They will not refuse their aid because this organization is not perfect in its operations, but on the contrary, with true American aggressiveness, will take part to correct its shortcomings. They will not because of their own happiness hug the delusion that others are free of misery, but on the contrary, out of gratitude for the blessings they enjoy, will labor to make others happy. We need and we call for such reinforcements in our war against poverty, ignorance and disease.

In the successful conduct of this war lies fame—if that be a desideratum to any member—but above and far more reaching than this is the satisfaction that will come to him who has exhibited in some practical manner his love for his fellow-men. And so I say to the young men and the young women, to whom these words may come, there is no field of labor that more directly challenges the exercise of your highest energies than that which I have pointed out. To the extent that you have the power to study and grasp these problems, possess yourselves thereof, and with patience, courage and utter sinking of self, labor to solve them. Every effort in such a direction is a prayer to which you will find a full and adequate response whenever you have succeeded in substituting a smile for a tear and a laugh for a groan. If you shrink from taking up such work because it will bring you into unpleasant associations, or involve you in labor, or subject you to disappointments and even to affronts, do not forget that great works cannot be achieved without great sacrifices, and that when duty beckons, we should respond with ready feet, though the road be obstructed and full of thorns. You have inherited a history that imposes sacrifices upon you, and by making them you will bequeath to those who follow you, a history fit to be linked with that which your fathers made.

THE JEWS IN AMERICA.

BY LEO N. LEVI.

How goodly are thy tents, Oh Jacob! thy tabernacles, Oh Israel.—(24 Numbers 5.)

PREFACE.

In May, 1884, the writer had occasion to deliver a speech in which he set forth his views upon some of the subjects discussed in this volume. At the conclusion of his remarks he was urged to allow them to be published. The speech being extemporaneous this was not feasible at the time, but under the impulse of the moment a promise was made that his views should be committed to paper, by the speaker. The result was a series of papers prepared during such leisure as was afforded by a busy professional life, and which papers were published serially in the "American Israelite" under the title of "The Jews of Today."

The most flattering reception was accorded to this essay and no little discussion was provoked by the ideas advanced therein. From all parts of the country the author has been earnestly requested to publish his work in a more convenient and durable form. Thus moved, he has revised and corrected it as well as could be done in the limited time at his disposal, and he now ventures to submit it to the charitable criticism of the public.

LEO N. LEVI.

Galveston, Texas, July 4, 1887.

INTRODUCTION.

It is my purpose to discuss the present status and consequent duties of the Jews, and especially of those residing in the United States of America.

It may become necessary at times in the course of this essay, to take a hasty glance at the larger and most general outlines of modern Jewish history. No effort, however, will be made to convey such information as it is the province of the historian to impart. This is in no sense of the word an historical effort, and it is addressed to those who are presumed to be familiar with the traditions and chronicles of the Jews. From the history of this people I shall, however, seek to obtain support for the propositions I shall advance.

Naturally enough, considering the purpose of my work, I shall address myself principally to my co-religionists. I shall, so far as I may be able, confine myself to a conservative examination and discussion of my subject. I recognize, however, the probability of a surrender at times to those sentiments which naturally arise from blood, birth and education. I presume I am not more free than other men from ordinary human weaknesses, and I desire to apologize in advance for any enthusiasm that may savor of extravagance.

For the Jewish faith I have that veneration which is due to the oldest and most enduring of all religions; and for the people who have practiced and preserved it for thousands of years I have the most unbounded admiration. As each succeeding century unfolds to wider scope the history of the world, more apparent becomes the sublimity and grandeur of that portion of it which pertains to the Jew. The traveler in passing through

a valley, fails to acquire a knowledge of its outlines, its extent, or its general features. The murmur of the brook, the music of the trees, the odor of the flowers, the verdure of the sward, attract and intoxicate the eye, but familiar acquaintance with these details does not leave a general and comprehensive idea of the whole. But when the limits of the valley are reached, and the wearied traveler climbs the summit of a hill, he turns and sees, not the lovely flowers and trees and lawns that erstwhile so delighted him—they are merged in the larger outlines of the landscape—but his eye takes in the boundaries of the valley, notes the relative position of each hill and wood, and traces through the scene the silvery thread of the winding stream. The little delights and sweet sensations produced by the brook's babble, or the gay colors of a wild flower, are no longer experienced, but in their stead is the quiet satisfaction of viewing a wide landscape, beautiful in its outlines, and harmonious in its blending of light and shade. The future is to history like the mountain to the valley. It is only when the details of events are lost in their larger outlines that we can take a comprehensive view of them and understand their true relation to other events and to history as a whole.

No feature in the landscape of the past is so prominent as the Jew; none so full of interest, none so fruitful of the lessons that may and should be drawn from what has transpired. To make a comprehensive history of the Jew is to write a history of the world. He is associated with its genesis, its government and its destiny. He furnished the medium through which was promulgated a code of general laws, comprised in hardly a dozen sentences, yet so complete that it embraces the whole course of life, and so correct that its justice is not questioned. The greatest exemplars of all that is true, beautiful, good, wise and powerful in humanity were Jews. From their ranks were drawn the greatest lawgiver, the wisest ruler, the most valiant warrior, and sweetest singer, and the most celebrated of all, that lowly man whose sinless life and martyrdom on the cross founded a religion that numbers its devotees by millions in every civilized portion of the globe.

There is much that is dark and unattractive in the history of the Jews, but these blemishes serve to bring out in more vivid contrast the prevailing colors of virtue and truth. It is not to be wondered at, that they should inspire interest, admiration and respect in every bosom; it should excite amazement that any Jew should be wanting in pride of race. Entertaining such views, it is not unlikely that I shall give way at times to sentiments inspired by them. Perhaps I am an enthusiast, because of the prevalence among many contemporaneous American Jews of an indifference to the ancient traditions of their race. The flint throws out no spark save when much enforced. But for that indifference, I should not perhaps have been stirred to the conviction that if we are to fulfill our manifest destiny we must preserve our integrity as a people, and that to preserve our integrity it is necessary to be loyal to the teachings and traditions of our fathers.

Before proceeding, however, to the discussion of the problems presented by the present status of the Jews in the United States, let us pause to consider the causes which have brought about the remarkable developments in Jewish history now exhibited in this country.

There are at present, according to the accepted estimates, between 300,000 and 400,000 Jews in the United States of America. The vast majority of these are composed of those who came to this country within the last half century, and of their descendants. The Jewish immigrants to the United States of America have come principally from Germany, Poland and Russia. The causes which led them to forsake their native shores were, in a large measure, the same which influenced the immigrant at large. Persecution and oppression at home and the inborn desire for liberty, impelled the Jews of tyrannical Germany and Russia to seek new homes in a country of such great opportunities as ours.

Naturally enough, the majority of the immigrants was composed of those who were unable to achieve a comfortable livelihood and a respectable position in society at home and conse-

quently the morale of the early Jewish population of the United States was not of a very high standard.

The revolution of 1848 in Germany, however, influenced a great many highly educated Jews to come to America where they might express their views without fear of governmental interference.

The leaven of intelligence which thus entered into the Jewish colony in America, was productive of great results. There was already present as the result of an early exodus from Europe, a small, but highly cultured and very proud representation of the Portuguese and Spanish Jews commonly called *Sephardim.* They esteemed themselves the aristocracy of the Jews and looked down upon the *Ashkenazim,* as the German and Polish Jews are called, with the contempt ordinarily exhibited towards inferiors. This haughty exhibition on the part of the *Sephardim* speedily kindled a spirit of resentment on the part of the liberty-loving Germans, who had forsaken their homes in order that they might enjoy the blessings of freedom.

The *Sephardim* have always been conservative in their maintenance of the traditional religion of the Jews, and the customs of their ancestry, and even an atmosphere of liberty has not caused them to forsake the traditions of their fathers. Aristocracies are proverbially conservative and this perhaps may explain why the haughty Portuguese have been so slow to adopt innovations, even with respect to insignificant rites, ceremonies and forms.

No such influence was brought to bear upon the German immigrant to America. The German Jew is not only a democrat by nature, but more than that, he has been so long subjected to oppression, tyranny and contumely, that in his native country he is apt to consider himself an inferior and thus fall below the level of true manhood.

The history of the Jews in Germany, and in the German principalities, is one long chapter of tyrannical oppression, resulting as it was designed to result, in the degradation of this devoted people.

In the early part of this century when the money and the

muscle of the Jews were required by the German states to offset and overthrow the boundless ambition of Napoleon I, extraordinary privileges were granted to the Jews in order to secure their patriotic services against the little corporal, but as soon as the Corsican was overthrown and France humiliated by repeated disasters, the privileges that were extended to the Jews were withdrawn and their condition, if anything, became more unendurable than before. The seeds of the French revolution which had inspired Klopstock to write his matchless songs of liberty, found mellow soil in Germany, and the plant that began its precarious existence during the blood-shed of the first years of the century, had arisen to proportions that were deemed disastrous to monarchy before half the century had expired. It is unnecessary to review the events of 1848; suffice it to say, that not a few among the revolutionists were Jews and that a considerable number of those who were proscribed by the government at home, fled to the United States for refuge.

The effect of suddenly acquired liberty upon one who has been restricted, and as it were, enslaved, is always an enthusiasm that borders upon mental intoxication. As the schoolboy, when dismissed from his studies exhibits his exultation in shouts and riotous play, so the oppressed citizen when he escapes from the restrictions and tyranny to which he has been subjected, indulges in exhibitions of delight, that in a larger measure are like unto the ebulitions of the liberated schoolboy. So we find, that the German immigrant of 1848, released as he was by his exodus from Europe, from the confinements and the fetters of a monarchial government, became a democrat of the extremest type. The people became his God, and anything that savored of governmental power, was obnoxious. Extremes beget extremes: the pendulum that is swung beyond the natural limit of its vibration on one side, will pass beyond that limit when it returns to the other. A later and more unhappy illustration of this disposition of human nature, is to be found in the fact, that the Socialism, Nihilism and Anarchism which now prevail in the United States of America, are almost entirely supported by foreign born citizens

who escaped to this country because they could not endure the oppression of Europe.

It must be remembered, that in Germany, as in France, all churches are institutions of the government, the synagogue not excepted. In France Napoleon undertook after a fashion to revive the *Sanhedrin,* and in Germany for many years there has been a connection betwen the government and the synagogue by which the Rabbis were stipendiaries of the state and were invested by the government with a large measure of ecclesiastical authority. This authority thus based and armed with the power of execution operated as a restriction upon liberty, thought and action in religious matters and it is not to be doubted that the authority was not unfrequently exercised in a most arbitrary manner.

The fact that such great reformers arose in Germany as Holdheim, Frankel, Geiger and others, is sufficient evidence to prove that there were abuses in the Jewish church of Germany. As in ancient times, there was a disposition to make form of greater importance than substance, and to make piety consist of the slavish adherence to rites, ceremonies and customs, which, whatever may have been their utility or effectiveness in other days, inspired but little respect in the nineteenth century.

It is not uncommon for the public to confound the tenets of a religion with the forms in which worship is conducted, and when forms, rites and ceremonies engender disrespect or ridicule, the essential doctrines of the religion suffer in consequence.

The liberation of the German Jews who immigrated to the United States of America about the middle of this century, from all kinds of governmental interference in private, social and religious matters was not slow in its effect upon the Jewish religion. Those who had in many instances against their better judgment and against their sentiment been compelled to practice forms and ceremonies which inspired them with no respect, now found an opportunity to disregard them without fear of any evil consequences personal to themselves. The result of this new found liberty exhibited itself at once in the disuse and the abrogation of certain practices and forms by no means essential to the

preservation of the religion, and which were perhaps better discarded than retained. Rabbis who had been educated abroad in the old school finding this iconoclastic spirit, catered to it rather than undertook to restrain it and as each Rabbi who instituted a new reform was hailed as a great leader in Israel, a species of emulation arose among the Jewish divines as to which of them could outstrip the rest in discarding time-honored form and religious practices. The conservatism of the Sephardim so far from restraining this tendency, rather stimulated it by reason of their undisguised contempt for the Ashkenazim. The latter naturally enough disregarded what to their hated co-religionists was sacred.

In 1835 a very slight change was sought to be introduced in the Jewish ritual at Charleston, S. C., but at that time the radical element which afterwards came to this country having no exponents here, the movement failed for want of support. Twenty-five years later scarcely a synagogue in the United States was as conservatively conducted as it was proposed that the reform synagogue of Charleston should be. The ancient prayer books were laid aside and new rituals or *Minhags* were introduced. The men and women worshipped together, the organ and choir were introduced, the prayers were read in the vernacular of the country, and in many other ways changes and innovations were inaugurated, so that as has frequently been said, if an ancient Israelite should enter the modern temple, he would not recognize the services as being those of a Jewish church. There was no influence in the United States to restrain this tendency towards radicalism. There was no hierarchy in the synagogue, no authority vested in any Rabbi, no tribunal to which an appeal could be made in disputed cases. The pruning knife which was first applied only to forms and ceremonies that had outlived their usefulness, was applied from time to time to the very body of the religion itself, and as each daring innovator excited more or less admiration, and achieved a notoriety, which in his vanity he misconstrued for fame, a stimulus was offered for new excursions in this tempting field. The men of the cloth being thus so swift in their progress from everything that was ancient and traditional, naturally

enough engendered in the minds of the laity, the reflection that what was so easily altered, modified and set aside by human hands, could not be respected as of divine workmanship. The traditions which had been looked upon by them in their youth as sacred and beyond the pale of human interference, were now analyzed for them by specious pleaders and shown to be but idle nonsense. This was undermining the church itself, for as soon as the laity lost their respect for the traditional in Judaism, the whole structure ceased to inspire them with that affectionate awe which is always accorded to the time-honored and ancient.

It is not my purpose to trace from its origin to its present status, the so-called reform movement of America. To other and abler hands this task must be left. I merely desire to call attention to its rapid progress and to its extreme tendency, in order that I may show, as I think it is clear that to this reform movement is attributable altogether the indifference exhibited by the American Jews for everything that pertains to their lineage, their history and their destiny.

Among other things introduced by the so-called reform Rabbis of the United States, was the doctrine that the Jews were only such by reason of their creed and that their creed consisted of pure Monotheism and the practice of righteousness. The race idea was discountenanced as being obnoxious to the genius of the government under which we enjoy the greatest liberties accorded to us since we ceased to be a nation.

At Pittsburg in 1885, a conference of American Rabbis even went so far I believe as to promulgate in what was called "The Postulates of Reason" that the Jews were no longer a race, but simply a religious community.

This pronunciamento, which was to be expected as the result of all the radicalism that preceded it, was hoped would strike a responsive chord in the breast of the American Jews. I may have occasion before I complete this effort to consider the correctness of the proposition that we are simply a religious community and not a race. Nothing to my mind is more pregnant with error than this postulate of *unreason*. However, whether it be correct or not, it was so often preached from the pulpit and so frequently

found a lodgement in the minds of the laity, that doubts of the gravest nature have arisen in the minds of the American Jews as to the perpetuity of the Jews as a people. In every controversy there is to be found a large element wanting in any fixity of principles and in any elements of courage; people who wait until the progress of the struggle indicates where the victory will lie and then join the strongest forces. This unfortunate weakness of human nature is well understood by the politician and hence in every political battle we find each party long in advance of the struggle claiming an easy victory. The doubt having arisen in the minds of many American Jews as to the perpetuity of the Jews as a people, and the conviction having been forced upon many that our days were numbered, and that we would be merged in, and swallowed up by the mass of humanity at large, there was engendered, not only an indifference as to this result, but many positively desired to hasten its accomplishment. This is not the first time in the history of the Jews that such doubts and convictions have arisen, and history affords examples of conversions of large numbers of Jews to other religions, simply in deference to what was conceived to be the unavoidable and inevitable extinction of the Jews. A few years since, some of the most thoughtful minds in this country had become gravely impressed with the idea that we were at the beginning of the end, and he who was daring enough to raise his voice against the tendency of the hour, was derided as striving to accomplish the impossible.

This conviction was not confined to those who desired the result which it portended, for many accepted it gloomily enough as a truth which they claimed was irresistible. The writer never shared this view, but has constantly been one of those who undertook to breast the torrent and to stay the hand of the destroyer. The work which he now projects is in that direction. When it was begun, the whole sky was dark with clouds and scarcely a ray of hope was to be discovered, but in the short space of time which has intervened between the inception and the completion of this effort, large rifts have been made and the sunshine of a future of promise for the Jews breaks over the landscape.

The radicalism which culminated at Pittsburg in 1885, aroused a storm of indignation throughout the land which caused its collapse at Cincinnati in the summer of 1886. The Pittsburg conference which adjourned to meet at Cincinnati failed to convene. The new generation of American Jews free from the intoxication resulting from sudden emancipation, and whose minds have developed in an atmosphere of liberty, look at the questions involved from a different *locus standi* from that adopted by the Jews of a former generation. The American born Jew has had the benefit of an American education. As has been said, he was born and has grown up in an atmosphere of liberty; he knows no other condition. He is not impelled to license as the anti-climax of enslavement; he becomes not riotous, in need or thought by reason of any enfranchisement, for he has never been disfranchised. Like most native born Americans, while ready to die for republican institutions, he recognizes that republicanism does not mean Anarchy and that the surrender of certain elements of individual liberty is a pre-requisite to the preservation and maintenance of liberty. And so in religious matters, when he has come to contemplate the vast changes that have been made by irresponsible persons in so short a time and in deference to so sordid a spirit, his mind recoils and he refuses to recognize the right of any man to rudely lay his hands upon the traditions of his fathers. By his achievements in every sphere of life he has conquered the prejudice against his people and has claimed as his right, the respect of his fellow men. The triumphs of the Jews in the arts, literature, science and in finances has cast around the name of "Jew" a halo of which he is intensely proud. He is impelled to study the history of his people, to learn of their martyrdom, their endurance and their triumphs, and since the history of the Jews is inextricably interwoven with the religion of the Jews he has been compelled in studying their history to learn their religion. And he has learned that what is divinely ordained or derived from traditions that extends to a period whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, may not be rudely cast aside, or brushed away by men, the fountain of whose authority extends not higher than themselves. For these so-called

reformers who halt not for sentiment nor reason he has no respect, but rather says with Cassius,

> "I had as lief not be, as live to be
> In awe of such a thing as I myself."

The effort to decry the race character of the Jew, which of all others is the most absurd, finds no sympathy in the American Jew. I make these assertions now with no fear of a successful contradiction, for the developments of the past year furnish incontrovertible evidence of their truth. But while the educated and reflecting Jew is indisposed to be led by the revolutionists, few have any definite notions of what is the duty of the hour and the great mass of the people by reason of the indifference which has been planted, as has already been shown, in their natures have failed to give the subject any consideration whatsoever. Therefore the author believes that he performs a simple duty to present his reflections upon the status, the duties and the destiny of the Jews in this country, not in the hope that his views will prove acceptable to all those who read, but rather in the fond expectation that those who read will be induced to reflect and to discuss the views that shall occur to them by reason of the stimulus I shall offer, and thus there may be evolved from a multitude of counsel that wisdom which the emergency requires.

It is my purpose in the course of this essay to show that it is the duty and the policy of the Jews to preserve their solidarity, and that in order to secure such a result it is essential that the highest respect should be paid to the history and traditions of our people, to the preservation of our customs within certain limitations, and the practice of our religion with due deference to those ancient forms that were practiced by our ancestors in times of gravest adversity and peril; and this leads me first to inquire, should the Jews perpetuate their race, or suffer themselves to be merged into and assimilated by the different peoples of the earth?

CHAPTER I

Wherein is Considered the Right and Duty of the Jews to Perpetuate Their Existence as a Distinct People.

In considering the duty and policy of the Jews in respect of the preservation of their integrity as a people, it becomes necessary at the threshold to inquire into our right to remain an exclusive people.

This involves the wide subject of whether there should be any distinct peoples, and if so, whether the distinction may be properly made save upon national and territorial lines. It is contended, that as the Jews are only such because of a community of creed, that they may not persevere in their exclusiveness without violence to the proper sensibilities of their neighbors. Voltaire made this one of the chief bases of his strictures on the Jews and even to this day we hear complaints made of the clannishness of this remarkable people. If it were true that the Jews are such, simply because of a community of creed, it would be proper to inquire into the right of any religious community to segregate itself and in a measure abstain from intercourse with the world at large, but it seems to me to be an idle discussion as to the propriety of certain facts which do not exist.

It is not true in the first place that the Jews are abnormally clannish; it is not true in the second place that the Jews are only Jews because of their religion. This idea has become prevalent because the Jews have no territorial and no temporal government and hence are not accorded the dignity of a race. History contains no record, so far as I am advised, of any distinct people preserving their manners, customs, traditions and laws, and what is more remarkable, the purity of their blood, without the cohesive power of a country, and a temporal government, except it be the Jews. The gypsies can certainly not be accorded so high a distinction, and aside from them I know of none other that approxi-

mates such an instance. At another place I shall discuss this remarkable characteristic of the Jewish people. For the present I must assume that the Jews are not simply an indiscriminate lot of people who hold to a common belief. A native Esquimaux, or American Indian might conscientiously adopt every tenet of the Jewish church, might practice every form and ceremony imposed by the Jewish laws and the Jewish ritual, and so far as the religion is concerned, be a Jew, but yet, no one who will reflect for a moment would class them with the Jews as a people. If the truth were known, a very large percentage of so-called Christians would be found to be believers in the essentials of the Jewish religion, and yet, they are not Jews. It requires not only that men should believe in Judaism, but that they should be the descendants in direct line of that people who enjoyed a temporal government and who owned a country up to the time of the destruction of the second commonwealth. That great event took away from the Jews their country and their temporal government; it scattered them over the face of the earth, but it did not destroy the national and race idea which was a part of their nature and of their religion, and though nearly two thousand years have elapsed since that memorable occasion, we find that there are more Jews today than there were then, richer in the enjoyment of liberty, greater in the exercise of power, further advanced in culture and with a strain of blood preserved by steady, direct and undefiled flow from the original source.

Who shall say then, that the Jews are no longer a race? The world numbers seven million of them among its population. When Moses led the Jews from Egypt to Palestine, it is estimated that there were three million of the children of Israel in his train. The seven million who now exist are the direct descendants of that chosen people. Certainly it will not be contended that a strip of territory over which a lot of men exercise dominion, nor that a form of government which men may exercise, constitute a race. Blood is the basis and sub-stratum of the race idea and no people on the face of the globe can lay claim with so much right to purity of blood, and unity of blood, as the Jews. Be it remembered, that I do not claim nationality for the Jews as such,

for they have had no such claim since Jerusalem was captured by the Romans, but nationality and the race quality are two separate and distinct things. It is well known that when The Netherlands were hard pressed by their enemies on one occasion, the grand idea was conceived of utilizing the vast amount of shipping in the Dutch ports for an exodus of the Hollanders and after their departure to cut the dikes and flood the country so that it might not become a prey to the national foe. Had this idea been carried into effect and the brave Netherlands had forsaken their country and gone abroad to populate as they designed, some distant land, would it be contended that they had lost their race character by reason of their exodus? It seems to me that such a conclusion would be most lame and impotent. If I have reasoned to any purpose, the inquiry of right in the premises is not to be limited to the Jews as the exponents of a particular creed, but to the Jews as a race. I recognize the anomaly presented by the fact that this race, as I claim them to be, is scattered over the face of the globe, divided up into many sections, and the different sections owing allegiance to different governments, but what is there about the Jew that is not anomalous? In everything that pertains to him he is *sui generis*. There is nothing incompatible between the preservation on his part of the race idea, and the utmost fealty to the government under which he lives. I need not discuss this, for there can be no conflict of allegiance to a mere idea, and a government. In his relation to his government, the American Jew is an American citizen. He observes the laws of his country, he contributes to the support of his country, he is ready to fight her battles abroad and to spend his last drop of blood and treasure in defence of her shores against any and every invader, and if the ranks of the enemy be composed of his co-religionists, yet will he regard them as his enemies, for neither his religion nor his race idea is ever suffered to interfere with his patriotism, nor his allegiance to the powers that be. (My son fear the Lord and the King Prov. 24-21).

The inquiry therefore broadens into the question, should there be any classes among men—any distinctions because of race, nationality, complexion, customs, habits, etc.?

There are theorists who would erase from the map of existence every line that separates men from their fellow-men, classes from other classes, nations from other nations, and even continents from continents; and their efforts are lauded as the highest and most enlightened philosophy by the same class of critics who extol a leaden-colored canvas as the perfect representation of the skies. There is much plausibility in the proposition that, as all men are men, endowed with the same physical and mental attributes, constituting a distinct class of animals, subject to be swayed by the same affections, manifesting like sentiments and sensations, they should be brothers in the most exalted meaning of the word. It is claimed, in the words of the great "apostle of freedom," that "all men are created free and equal;" that all men have equal rights; and that there is something essentially and inherently false in any social or governmental system which makes distinctions among classes of men or among individuals. The vice of the argument lies in this: The enthusiast confounds a law of classification with a law of existence. What science has discovered for convenience of definition, has been accepted as the key-note in the scale of human duty. To explain further: A definition may be defined as that process by which any entity is assigned to its proximate genus and at the same time distinguished from other members of the same class, by its specific difference. Thus negro is defined as a "man" (his proximate genus) "with black skin, flat nose and woolly hair" (his specific differences from other members of the human family).

A moment's reflection will convince my readers that the process of definition is necessary to intercourse between man and man, and that the process was contemporaneous with the inception of the means of intercourse. In primitive times when travel was difficult and infrequent, the different classes of men were strangers to each other. The sons of Ham knew only their dusky companions, and to their minds the idea of man had no wider range than their own particular type. So, too, with the sons of Shem and Japhet. In the course of ages a great number of different types were developed in each of the great branches, and each type considered itself the family of

man. But time and travel acquainted men with other men. Herodotus discovered many species of men, and while he distinguished them from the Greeks by many specific differences, yet there were enough characteristics in common between them all and the Greeks to assign them all to their proximate genus *"man."* This synthetic process by which the Caucasian, the Malay, the African, etc., are classed under a common designation has given rise to the fallacy that all men are men—and hence equal. It is perhaps true that all "men were created free and equal," but in all respects save their political rights their equality relates entirely to the particular moment of their creation. Socially, morally and physically every man is different in degree of merit from every other man. Only before the law are all men equal. But equality before the law does not comprehend equality upon any other plane. The two propositions are entirely distinct. If it be true that because we are all members of the human family we are equal and should fraternize, it is equally true that all men and all cats are animals, and hence are equal and should fraternize. We have the quality of existence in common with all entities—are we for this reason to be considered as violating a law of nature or a canon of duty, when we use an inanimate object for our own purposes without regard to its preservation or perpetuity? I appreciate the fact that by reversing this argument we may be led to the logical conclusion that any two objects, things or persons having specific differences are foreign to each other and should not fraternize. The answer to this is the solution of the whole problem. Nature has implanted in every animate creature a selfish spirit whose existence is necessary for the preservation of their natures. Selfishness is not only necessary for the existence of animate creatures, but it is the power under Heaven that works out the fate of the world. It is the keynote of all harmony, and is the basis of the highest virtues. The love of self brings order out of chaos, civilization out of barbarism, government out of anarchy, and compels the practice of the social virtues which otherwise would give way to social corruption. I do not employ the term selfishness to define that sordid and disgusting quality

which the word vulgarly implies, but I use it in that comprehensive sense which embraces the love and advancement of self. It is the love of self which precludes all men from being brothers in the sense which enthusiasts would have us regard all men; it is the love of self which precludes each man from remaining to and for himself separate from his kind. Man is a social and a progenitive animal. As a social animal he seeks society; as a progenitive animal he procreates. His self-love extends naturally to what is nearest and dearest to him. Self-love makes him jealous of the society and exclusive possession of his wife; self-love makes him protect and care for his offspring and enforce obedience from them. Thus the family relation, the highest of earthly ties, grows out of self-love. Shall we deny the right of any man to love his wife, the mother of his children, better than he does a strange woman utterly unknown to him? Selfishness makes every man care for the members of his own community or society, for every community or society *is formed for the benefit of its members,* and each member must care for and protect all of the others in order that he may derive the benefits of the community or society. The process of thought is lost sight of in the daily occurrences of life, but an analysis of the ordinary affairs of the world will convince the most superficial thinker that not only is the world operated according to the law of selfishness, but that without that law we would drift into chaos. It follows very clearly that by a natural law, the further is removed any person, object or thing from the existence of any man, the less will be his love for that person, object or thing. I do not mean physical propinquity of course, but I refer to the influence of relationship whether of blood, community of tastes, occupation, creeds, joys or dangers. The ratio, of course, is coequal with that of relationship.

It has been remarked that all entities have the quality of existence in common, but the relation is so slight that the love it elicits is very faint. If I may use a figure of speech I should compare love to the circle made on the surface of the sea by dropping a pebble in the water. At first it is distinct and well defined, but as it widens it grows fainter and fainter, until al-

though certainly still existent it is imperceptible. Every man bears some relation to all existence, and by reason and in the ratio of that relationship bears love thereto. But existence is composed of species beyond number. Comprehended in the immeasurable and infinite circle of existence are an infinite number of smaller circles, none of equal size, none concentric with another, none covering the same space, yet all related by the common circle which embraces all, which is contiguous immediately to the great circles representing the first classification of existences, and which great circles are contiguous to each other, and contain again within themselves the species which make up their hierarchy of existence. The tiniest snowdrop on Himalayas' loftiest height bears some relationship to the fieriest spark in the sun. The law of human nature which compels man's love to extend outward in all directions as the circle widens from the spot where the pebble gave it existence, does not impose upon him the duty of loving all things or all persons alike. Without difference in degrees of love according to relationship, we should be deprived of the holiest and most exalting ties and obligations and the sanctity of the home circle, the institution of marriage, the parental, filial and fraternal love would be swallowed up into that universal and uniform love, which would, after all, be but indifference.

If I have argued to any purpose it must be clear that if all men are brothers it is because they are men, not because they are governed by a common fraternal feeling—*Sum homo nihil humani a me alienum puto* is a sentiment which with great propriety might be extended. In a different degree but of like nature is the truth, "I am an animal and I esteem nothing animate as foreign to me." If I am asked at what point fraternity should cease, I can only say that the limits are regulated by circumstances. Wherever may be found a community of sentiment, blood, circumstances, occupations, tastes, creeds, joys, sorrows or dangers there will be found fraternal ties limited by the particular community which engendered them. This is the brotherhood of classes, and it is this fraternity which is derided and discouraged by the visionaries who exclaim that all men are

brothers, and there should be no castes, cliques, clans, nations or peoples. An universal brotherhood would no doubt follow the attainment of universal virtue and the perfection of the human family. When the standard of human perfection is discovered and all men attain that standard, then, and not till then will all men be brothers; but as long as men entertain differences of opinions so long will there be classes. If the formation of new classes could be discontinued, the classes now existing might be merged into one (although I doubt even this); but new classes must necessarily spring up. They may not come into existence by any name, they rarely do, but circumstances form them with unceasing regularity.

It is in entire conformity with the laws of nature for men to unite in the pursuit of any legitimate object. Artists form societies among themselves in which the "tie that binds" is the love and practice of art. In such a society creed or nationality go for naught, the open sesame and the ritual being art. To the soldier every soldier is a brother. Every profession has its freemasonry. Every devotee is a brother to the followers of his own faith. The subjects of every government are united by their common nationality.

Such circumscriptions operate nothing against the usefulness of those thus circumscribed. We have all our parts to play, and in playing them we can neither enter every circle nor confine ourselves to one. There are certain duties which we owe to our fellow-men in return for the benefits we derive from the social state, and they must be performed.

To do less is to violate the law of our obligations to society, which is the companion of the law of self-love in the government of the world.

Society is composed of elements owing to one another correlative obligations, the prompt discharge of which is a prerequisite to the orderly regulation and progress of the whole. Herbert Spencer compares society to an organic structure having parts and functions analogous to those of animate creatures in his comparison, "Government is represented by the regulative

functions of a living organism, and forms of government so many varieties of the structure."

Professor Edmund Robertson, commenting in the *Brittanica* upon the views of Herbert Spencer, announces the familiar truth, that where men are united in groups there arises from their union the necessity of action in behalf of the group. "It is, of course, always a matter of difficulty to determine the exact nature and degree of obligation which individuals owe to society, for the reason principally, that the origin of society is lost in the obscurity of unexplored antiquity. If there ever was a time when society did not exist among the members of the human family in some form or other, history is silent as to that era."

Various theories have been advanced in explanation of the genesis of society, all of them being plausible, and none entirely satisfactory.

Professor Robertson in his article on government in the *Brittanica,* briefly, but clearly, considers the various theories that have been advanced, but he is unable to arrive at any conclusion with reference to the subject, except the bare suggestion, that government had its origin in the family relation. Locke, in his essay on civil government, asserts, that men being by nature all free, equal and independent, no one can be put out of this estate and subjected to the political power of another, without his own consent. The only way whereby any one divests himself of his natural liberty and puts on the bonds of civil society, is by agreeing with other men to join and unite into a community. Mr. John Stuart Mill in his essay on liberty and in his political economy declares in favor of the largest scope of individual liberty as being inherent and favors the doctrine of Humboldt, to-wit: "The absolute and essential importance of human development in its richest diversity."

Herbert Spencer also maintains the natural and inherent liberty of individuals without restriction and that government and society are founded upon the voluntary surrender by individuals of a portion of the liberties which are a part and parcel of their nature and birthright.

According to such eminent authority, and plainly in accord-

ance with reason, it would seem then that all men are born with the right to do as they please, and that this liberty of action is only curtailed by the requirements of society and government, which themselves are the creatures of the individuals. Society and government both were created and are maintained by the operation of that law of self-love on the part of individuals, of which I have already spoken. In the absence of civil society, and of government, the individual must look solely to himself for the protection of his own welfare, his life, his liberty and his property. This constant vigilance, and perhaps this constant state of war, as Hobbes would have us believe, was the case with primitive man, was naturally distasteful, and to accomplish its abrogation, the "social compact" was formed, either by express agreement, or what is more probable, by the natural growth of implied obligations. The stronger were compelled to surrender their advantages by combinations among the weak, and thus the basis was laid for measuring in a manner, the extent of the surrender by each individual of a portion of his inherent liberty. The first law of society, as of nature, was order. The preservation of the peace and the pursuit of the ordinary avocations of life without the constant menace of interference from without, must have been the primary aims of those who leagued together in the construction of some kind of social organization. With the progress of time the scope of society's duties widened, the governmental sphere was extended and the advantages offered by them to the individual gradually multiplied. There arose accordingly a correlative increase of obligations on the part of the individual to society and to government. The discharge of these obligations by the individual to his fellow-men, to society and to government, are in strict conformity with the law of self-love which primarily regulates his course of life, for he recognizes at a glance that any failure on his part begets failures on the part of others and anarchy will speedily follow. The citizen who maintains the law, is as often actuated by selfish considerations as by patriotism and an exalted sense of duty. Whatever may be the motive, however, for the discharge of these duties, it is patent enough that they must be discharged,

and since our duty to society and to government is next in point of importance to the duty which we owe our Creator, obligations that we may assume of less solemnity must perforce yield if they come in conflict with our duty to society, or our government.

If I have made myself clear, it easily follows that there is no danger to society, nor to the government under which we live, in the maintenance of certain species of class distinctions. The right to unite and to organize for any purpose is inherent, for it is a part of individual liberty, and it is only limited by our obligation to our Creator, our government and to our fellowmen.

It follows that the formation or maintenance of any circle that operates against the good of society, present or prospective, or interferes with the performance of individual duty to society or God, should be discouraged; that any circle which does not operate thus prejudicially, but which in anywise contributes to the enjoyment, elevation or advantage of its members, should be encouraged. If it be remembered that perfect virtue in the whole human family would bring about universal brotherhood, every circle which promotes a virtue will be recognized as a means to the great end, even though it have the appearance of a step in the wrong direction. Heat is a great curative agency in treating burns.

Nature is full of arguments in support of the propositions that I have advanced, for, within the almost incomprehensible unity of nature is comprised innumerable classes. Science has undertaken as great a task in analyzing *genera* into their various species by analysis, as it has in resolving species into *genera* by synthesis. If the visionary contends that it is foreign to the law of nature that men should divide themselves into classes, it need only be suggested that nature herself presents us with ineffaceable class distinctions. The Mongolian and the Caucasian are both men, but nature, or rather their creator, has endowed each with qualities, and invested each with peculiarities that mark them as distinct types of the human family and so through the whole range of the animal, the vegetable and the mineral kingdoms we find entities that have a sufficient number

of common qualities to be classed under a given genus, and yet possessing sufficient specific differences to be placed under different classifications. Not only so, but nature places her seal of condemnation upon any undue intermixture of incongruous elements. The hybrid and the mongrel are proverbially inferior, and of them it has been said that they partake of the worst qualities of both parents, and the good qualities of neither. If the general doctrine which I have assailed were true, then miscegenation between the African and Caucasian would be a virtue, rather than a violation of a natural law.

I have already shown that the distinctive character of the Jew does not arise solely from his religion. It is true that his race and religion are indissolubly connected, a fact which arises in the main from the theocratic form of government under which the Jews existed as a nation, but whatever be the cause of this junction of the race idea with the religion, it is very certain that the religion alone does not constitute the people. As I have already maintained, a believer in the Jewish faith does not by reason of that fact become a Jew. On the other hand, however, a Jew by birth remains a Jew, even though he abjures his religion. Disraeli recognized this, and though he professed to be a sincere Christian, always claimed to be a Jew.

Assuming then that I have established that there is no inherent wrong in the preservation of the solidarity of the Jew as a people, it remains to apply the arguments which I have adduced in support of this proposition to the particular subject that we have in hand.

To apply the argument to the Jews is not without difficulty. General principles are often easily deducible from a multitude of examples, but when deduced it is not easy to apply them. It is not doubtful that if the Jews are benefited by remaining Jews in fact as well as in name, and no overbalancing injury is done to society thereby, they should perpetuate their existence as Jews. I leave out of consideration all questions of religious duty. This is not a discussion from a religious but from a social standpoint. Aside from all considerations of religion, to my mind it is clear that the Jew should remain a Jew, and the Jews as such should preserve their integrity as a distinct people.

CHAPTER II.

Wherein is Considered the Possibility of Perpetuating the Existence of the Jews as a Distinct People.

Before entering into the consideration of the propriety and expediency of preserving the distinctive character of the Jews as a people, it is proper to pause and consider the *possibility* of accomplishing such a result. It is contended, that as all things change and pass away, so too will the Jews suffer a radical alteration in their constitution and gradually pass out of existence. The pages of history are pointed to in support of the prophecy that in the course of human events this great people who have existed so long, will cease to be. In other words, that it is inevitable destiny, and if this be true, it is said, why struggle against the inevitable? I do not share this view, and I beg the patience of the reader while I submit the reasons which impel me to discredit such gloomy forebodings.

There is always something pathetic in the decay of power. The strong man whose strength fails him always excites commiseration. It is the inevitable in every life, but like death, which none may hope to escape, it draws forth a sigh of regret, none the less tender and heartfelt because wholly in vain. The history of nations is fraught with a like pathetic destiny. Gibbon, of whom it was said, "that he was the only historian of the eighteenth century who survived the criticism of the nineteenth," remarks in his great history of "Rome's Decline and Fall," that "the history of all nations may be written in five words—valor, greatness, discord, degeneracy and decay." Is this true of the Jews? Are we, too, passing along the great highway of decay in obedience to any inexorable law? I trust, I believe not. If so, however, this appeal is in vain. Therefore I pause to consider that rule. Gibbon's sentence is dramatic, brilliant, climacteric and striking; it is not without serious claims to accuracy besides. It

is obnoxious to criticism as being a prominent and attractive fragment of that philosophy of history which assigns to each historical event its place in the entire story, making them all fit as nicely as the different scenes in a drama. The history of modern historians reads more like fiction than truth, not perhaps without reason. The plain recital of facts that once passed for history has fallen into desuetude, and we have now subtle analyses of times, characters, events, manners and customs, so ingeniously carried out that the most remote events are brought into direct connection and the most different results traced to a common cause. It is not to be doubted that the study of history becomes largely more profitable when it involves the search for the causes of events as well as a knowledge of the events; but it is doubtful to my mind if it be of advantage to let others do our searching or thinking. The human intellect is ever restless and grasping. Man suffers from curiosity and ignorance; there is always in him a yearning not only to know that a thing *is,* but *why* and *how* it is. There is great pleasure in the satisfaction of this yearning. Whenever the mind finds a resting place; whenever in other words it satisfies itself as to the *how* and *why* of anything, a pleasurable feeling follows. Hence the popularity of modern histories. Historians who plausibly explain events and connect eras with one another meet with favor because they satisfy this yearning. It is because of this tendency of our natures that we are prone to accept as true, such a law of history as that announced by Gibbon. Let us consider that tendency more fully in order that we may better understand whether our satisfaction with the annunciation of the law is a safe basis upon which to predicate its universal application. Every schoolboy knows and we all remember the genuine pleasure derived from and in the study of mathematics. To reach the solution of a difficult problem is a great triumph. It elevates one's self in one's own estimation. It makes the heart glow with self-satisfaction. But let it be remembered right here that the pleasure is equal whether the solution be right or wrong so long as we deem it correct.

The same rule applies to the study of great philosophical questions. The pleasure of solution is great, and so long as the solu-

tion be deemed correct, the pleasure derived by the thinker is unaffected by the real truth or falsity of his doctrine. Unfortunately, here the parallel ends. Mathematics is an exact science; philosophy applied to political and social questions is not. In the first an error is quickly and inevitably discovered; in the latter it may pass unchallenged forever. Therefore there is danger in the propensity we have for reaching solutions—the yearning we have for resting our minds on a conclusion; for the solution or conclusion may be essentially wrong, although entirely satisfactory, and our proneness to reach solutions and conclusions is apt to precipitate us into error. Our anxiety to rest our minds is the prolific mother of fallacies, and our errors of judgment are in the ratio of our anxiety to rest our minds. Thus it is a well-known fact that people who are slow to make up their minds are more generally correct than those who jump at conclusions. The wish is father to the thought, and conclusions are arrived at frequently because they are plausible and afford a satisfactory rest for the mind. Observe how attractive yet how painful are mysteries; how irresistible is the impulse to account for them by an hypothesis. What youth has not pondered over the authorship of the letters of Junius or the identity of the Man with the Iron Mask? Who has ever been indifferent to the solution of a local mystery or could rest until his mind had adopted some theory in explanation? And let me ask in this connection how often have these theories been verified by the development of the true facts? If the reflecting reader will recall a number of incidents that have come under his own observation, and will compare his theories with subsequently ascertained facts, he will appreciate the truth of this paradox: *Nothing is so apt to delude as the plausible.* It is told of a noted detective that he always doubted what seemed the most plausible solution of a mystery. If this be true he was an extremist, and probably more often deceived than not; but it is not to be gainsaid that there was method in his madness. Gibbon's brilliant sentence is a great relief to the mind in reading history. It offers a rule that is plausible, and which explains much that is otherwise perplexing. I am not prepared to denounce it as always unsafe, but I cannot subscribe to it as being universal. Its

champion will argue down every fact that limits scope in order to accommodate facts. This species of advocacy is as old as controversy itself. One historian will fritter away every fact that operates against the perfect virtue or peerless greatness of his hero; another will smother every fact that would invest the same character with a single "virtue among a thousand crimes." Nor is this surprising. There is no doctrine so absurd but what it may find devoted and able champions with sword or pen, and we are so apt to cling to our own theories that our loyalty increases as they are attacked. Such championship, however, overleaps itself, and the champion himself, like Prince Rupert, after destroying and pursuing the enemy immediately in his front finds himself hemmed in by others on either side. The great soldier and the wise thinker are ever conservative. They are willing and ready to keep their minds always in unrest rather than adopt a false conclusion. The true philosopher cares nothing for plausibility; truth is his desideratum, and with a judicial mind he is prepared to abandon a rule that will not accommodate itself to facts that he refuses to ignore or pervert.

If the reader has a mind to pursue this line of thought further than it would be proper to consider it here, I commend to him the study of metaphysical writings. If you would seek an explanation of the manner in which the human intellect operates, seek it in Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. You will find a satisfactory answer to many queries. Pursue your investigations further and you will find that Kant, Descartes, Spinoza, Malebranche, Jouvins, Reid, Stuart, Hamilton, etc. are all equally plausible, and that all differ more or less.

The rule which Gibbon announces for writing national histories has its exceptions, which may or may not be numerous enough to destroy the rule. I shall not venture an opinion as to that. It is only pertinent for me to inquire whether or not the rule, if it be one, applies to the history of the Jews.

It is a commonly accepted doctrine that "revolutions never travel backward," which is but a more general statement of the rule which I have just criticised and, of course, is subject to the same criticism. It is easy to say that a revolution or a history

pursues a course like an arrow shot into the air; but it were just as easy to compare them to a pendulum. Either comparison might be defended, and both shown to be plausible; they are probably neither correct. I do not wish to be misunderstood as decrying the effort to find general laws. That would be to decry science itself, for the highest office of science is to discover laws in explanation of phenomena, and it follows that the discovery of the most general law is the highest achievement of science. The highest aim of science is the most general law, and the search should and in the nature of things must be never-ending; for it is a striving after the infinite. What I do wish to maintain is that the eagerness of the search is apt to make the seeker prematurely cry Eureka, and declare as the law what seems to be, or is desired to be, the law. That is to substitute the shadow for the substance, the desire for the thing desired. It is the same weakness or impulsiveness which makes the eager miner mistake pyrites of iron for free gold. The former looks like the precious metal, but when placed in the assayer's crucible the delusion is dissipated. The history of the Jews is not written in the five words of Gibbon; it is not a revolution that has never reversed its course. It is rather like a mountain stream, whose source is on some inaccessible height, whose course varies to accommodate the surface it traverses; now winding around a hill, now creeping through a valley; now dashing over a cliff; ever and anon losing itself in the bowels of the earth, to appear again with renewed vigor; now apparently frittered away, only to gush from some distant rock on the opposite side of a hill; now pushing sturdily toward the sea, and then winding its way around a hill toward the morning of its existence; and at last typifying the future of the Jews by being lost to human ken in some unexplored cave.

Neither their existence nor greatness as a nation or a people had its genesis in their valor. Physical courage has always been an incident, not an element, of the Jewish character. It has no independent existence in their make-up, and always depended upon something else. With some exceptions this may be said of all Oriental people. The sense and fear of danger is highly developed in them, and there is no cultivation of that indifference to it.

which has distinguished the great nations of Western Europe. On the other hand in assertion or defense of a principle no people have succeeded so well in overcoming physical fear in order to wrest the right from the very jaws of danger. To my mind this is the highest order of courage. He who marches with determination to the cannon's mouth, with blanched cheek and fluttering heart, is a hero in that he overcomes himself; he who rushes forward with a laugh on his lip is but a little better than the brute that does not appreciate danger. I have read somewhere an anecdote of two soldiers riding into battle who represented the two species of courage that I have mentioned. One was pale and nervous, the other free-hearted and gay. The latter taunted the former with being afraid. The answer came quick and to the point. The pale soldier drove his spurs home, and as his horse sprang forward, cried: "So I am, and if you were half as frightened you would be riding in the opposite direction." Nations that are established in greatness may depend upon the courage born of principle for defense, but a nation that has to carve out its destiny must have courage independent of principle. Hengist and Horsa had no principles to govern them, yet they boldly sailed out into the tempestuous sea, through the stormy channel, and, landing upon a foreign hostile shore, acquired by the right of conquest the little island upon which has grown a nation upon whose dominions the sun never sets.

Theirs was a courage of which conquerors are made. They knew but one law:

> "The good old plan
> That he should take who hath the power,
> And he should keep who can."

This is the "valor" that Gibbon names as the groundwork of national greatness. It has never been the substratum of Jewish success. The Jews have fought often, bravely and well, but always for principle. They have ever been patient and long suffering, and needed leaders to urge them to battle, but once convinced that the right and God was with them they marched unto battle

inspired by a courage that is not daunted by wounds or repulses, and seldom indeed did they battle in vain. [See Joshua, chaps. 6 and 7.]

It would be impossible to name the basis of Jewish greatness without opening the great Book. Save in that chronicle their genesis is unwritten, and I am reluctant to quote that to many of my readers. There is faith and faith. I know many intelligent persons who will implicitly believe a history of the moon written by some imaginative astronomer from experiment with a spectroscope, but who reject the general outlines even of a history that has run the gauntlet of criticism for thousands of years.

The history of the Jews itself conclusively proves that Gibbon's rule does not apply to the Jews. I have already shown that their greatness was not based upon that kind of valor to which the historian alludes. The most superficial student of Jewish history is entirely familiar with the discord that prevailed among the Jews at the time of their greatest apparent prosperity. The victory of Titus in the siege of Jerusalem was due in a greater measure to the discord which prevailed behind the walls, than to the courage of the Roman legions that lay before them, and not only in temporal matters were they then and have they since been distracted by intestinal controversies. In religious matters they have time and again been convulsed by the bitterest contentions, and they have degenerated in consequence of such discords and other circumstances pressing upon them from without, but they have never passed into the stage of decay. The nineteenth century found them emerging from centuries of oppression, from the evil effects of dissipation throughout the different nations of the globe, from distractions arising from religious differences, but notwithstanding we are confronted with the irrefragible fact that the Jews are more numerous, more powerful, more cultivated and more wealthy today than at any time in their history. The mission entrusted to them by their God has not yet ended: "And I will make of thee a great nation and I will bless thee and make thy name great and thou shalt be a blessing; and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curseth thee, and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Genesis, chap.

XII, 2, 3. The mission of Israel has not yet ended, nor will it cease as long as Polytheism and immorality exist. In a memorable lecture upon the growth of "Ethical Monotheism," by Rabbi Isaac S. Moses, of Milwaukee, delivered before the Unitarian Conference at Madison, Wis., the following language was employed: "In order to bring to mankind the flaming law of the sanctity of life in order to teach the awful burden of man's moral responsibility, Israel had to pass through a school of probation, such as no other nation has ever passed. Every religion is judged by its code of morals, but the true test of that code must be found in the history of its development and in the character of its representatives. Intertwined with Israel's historical life is the progress of his moral ideas. The God of Israel becomes the true God, because the morale of Israel proves to be the true morality. What explains the singular phenomenon, that of all the nations that once flourished and formed mighty empires, no trace nor vestige has remained except perhaps ruins and fragments; but Israel still exists, not merely as a relic of the past, but as a living wonder of the indestructibility of the Jewish faith and race? What has kept Israel alive amidst the destructive floods of fanaticism and unending persecutions? Was it merely his grand peculiar belief in the One God, or was it not rather his code of morals, the sanctity of his domestic life, the virtue of the men and the purity of the women of Israel, that wrought this miracle of preservation and survival of the morally fittest? The colossal empires of Asia crumbled into dust before the altar fires of Mylitta; the Greek States imbibed their death poison from the lips of Aphrodite; the iron State of the Romans melted away before the glance of Venus. Israel still lives, because he has made the Holy One his God; because he has heard the thunder word: "Ye shall be holy, because I, the Eternal, your God, am holy."

But laying aside the consideration of Jewish greatness from the standpoint of the Bible, and as the result of providential guidance, let us consider it in the light of history. In my judgment the greatness of the Jews has been, and is not so much in achievement of a positive character, as in endurance. Their

greatness consists more in what they have suffered, than in what they have done.

Patience and faith have been their weapons, and with them they have withstood for five thousand years every attack that bigotry could organize, valor could undertake and cruelty consummate.

Other nations may boast conquests and triumphs born of aggression, but though the fruits of victory have been manifold, they have not been enduring; *and it may be truly said that the nation whose greatness grows out of valor* passes through the stages of discord and degeneracy to decay. Persia, Athens, Sparta, Macedonia, Egypt, Assyria, Rome and Carthage have all played the same drama with different scenes. The Jew alone is *sui generis.*

But half the right is wrested,
When victory yields her prize;
And half the marrow tested,
When old endurance dies.

The greatest Jews suffered and endured to triumph. Jacob suffered and waited for fourteen years only to triumph in the possession of Rachel. Moses toiled in patience and meekly bowed to the fiat that forbade him the promised land. David suffered throughout youth from the persecutions of Saul, and in his age in the loss of his son; and Jesus, who is claimed to be a Prince of David's house, wrought more in a moment with the blood that trickled from his hands and feet than Pontius Pilate could achieve in centuries with all the legions of Rome at his back. Nor is it alone in the dim past that they have worked out a principle by the resistance of virtue and the influence of patient courage. The pages of profane history are as full of their triumphs as the Bible. Nero was not worse than Torquemado; the arena no more terrible than the Ghetto—but the same power of resistance that triumphed in earlier times over the persecutions of the heathen and the Christian, overcame in succeeding years the onslaught of the Turk and the Moor, the Spaniard and the English Puritan, the German infidel and the Slavic bigot. Theirs has been a

hardy growth that flourished in storm with more vigor than in calm.

"But from their nature will the tannen grow,
Loftiest on loftiest and least sheltered rocks.
Rooted in barrenness, where naught below
Of soil supports them 'gainst the Alpine shocks
Of eddying storms; yet springs the trunk and mocks
The howling tempest, till its height and frame
Are worthy of the mountains from whose blocks
Of bleak, gray granite into life it came,
And grew a giant tree; the mind may grow the same."

The same poet, Byron, in "Childe Harold," who wrote the above, and who suffered so much himself, says:

"All suffering doth destroy, or is destroyed,
Even by the sufferer, and in each event ends."

Invoke the past for nations that have escaped calamity and suffering only by ceasing to be, and a thousand will respond; ask for those that have destroyed calamity and suffering by living them down with patient courage, and the answer will come but from one—an answer spoken in the calm, brave voice of the Jew: "Thou callest me, and I am here." In this virtue of endurance I believe the Jews have a safeguard against the decay that has marked the history of all other peoples.

Nor has this spirit of endurance passed out from the Jewish character. They are as strong today in that respect as at any time in their history, and the chronicles of our own times point out as many Jewish martyrs as the history of Spain during the terrible dominion of Torquemado. The outrages that have been committed in the Balkan provinces and throughout all Russia, and even in civilized Germany, may well challenge ancient history for parallels, but throughout it all the inflexible spirit of the Hebrew has withstood persecution, and the light which burns on the altar of the chosen people is yet undimmed.

Jews become apostates at rare intervals from choice, but under

compulsion, never. It is true, that at times under great stress Jews have feigned conversion. Thus Prescott in his History of Ferdinand and Isabella, in the chapter devoted to the inquisition, says, "In this crisis the only remedy left to the Jews was a real or feigned conversion to Christianity. St. Vincent Ferrier, a Dominican of Valencia, performed such a quantity of miracles in furtherance of this purpose as might have caused the envy of any saint in the calendar, and these, aided by his eloquence, are said to have changed the hearts of no less than 35,000 of the race of Israel, which (significantly adds the historian) doubtless must be reckoned the greatest miracle of all."

That this power of resistance still exists among the Jews of our own time is not only proven by the results of persecutions in the East but by the sorry returns of the various societies founded for the purpose of proselyting the Jews. Statistics show that after the expenditure of thousands of treasure, only at rare intervals have such societies secured an ostensible convert, and the majority of these soon proved to be hypocrites, who merely abjured their religion in order that they might possess themselves of the tempting bribes which such organizations offered to presumed Jewish avarice.

Their long history of suffering for principle's sake is the legacy of the modern Jew, and it were the most barbarous disregard of the holy sentiment of national and family pride to cast it aside. Reverence for ancient institutions and loyalty to the principles out of which they grew are not the proper subject of commendation by argument. They are sentiments that grow and exist in noble natures, like the wild violet in the forest. The subtlest chemistry can not discover the particular law under whose operations the wild flower grows, nor substitute its growth; neither can logic discover the fount in the human organization whence flow our noblest sentiments. But we have an instinct common to us all which commends or condemns any development of the human mind and heart, and by this standard I feel safe in declaring that the strongest evidence of moral decay in any people is indifference to the traditions and principles of its forefathers.

The Jews in America have been relieved in a great measure of the pressure under which they have existed for years, and prosperity, coupled with liberty, has filled many of them with that pride of self which condemns all humility as degrading and all reverence as maudlin. Like the stream to which I have compared them they have been a great force as long as they have been confined to high and narrow limits, but now that they are freed from restrictions they are in danger of spreading in a thin, exposed sheet over the surface of the earth, and thus being ultimately lost. Shall we not rather channel for ourselves new and greater courses, in whose confines we shall continue to be a noble stream? Shall we not confine ourselves in the banks of Principles and Loyalty to the ancient traditions of our fathers, and thus preserve our integrity? We can if we will; and shall we not? What answer can the mind make to this plea of the heart? What reply can Utility make to this demand of Right? For myself, I should not care to inquire the consequence of keeping faith with my ancestors. To me it is sufficient that I am one of that people who have ever been a part of the world, yet distinct from it, and who, through storm and calm, have existed in their distinctive integrity, just as the gulf stream has flowed on forever as part of the sea, yet as a river running its endless course with the ocean for its banks. It were faithless, cowardly and inhuman to forget or disregard our past; and to cease to be in principle what our fathers were, is to forget or disregard. I do not contend that manners and customs should not change, but I maintain that the integrity of our people, the sacredness of the tie that unites us, the almost family relation among all Jews, which has been our safeguard in all ages, should be preserved in the exercise of that holy duty which was enjoined by the great Law-giver: "Honor thy father and thy mother that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God has given thee."

When Regulus was called upon to break faith with the Carthaginians, whose treachery has become proverbial, or advise his people to a disadvantageous treaty, he turned his back upon his country and his people, his wife and his children, his honors and

his life, because it did not become him, as a Roman, to betray his country nor, as a man, to violate his pledge. His life is the brightest page in Roman history, because it exemplifies the principle highest above all others, that the noblest virtue is to do right without regard to consequences.

"Not bestowed
In vain should such examples be."

We who are the "heirs of all the ages;" we whose veins contain the oldest and the purest blood; we who have survived Nebuchadnezzar and Semiramis, Alexander and Caesar; we who can point to the ever-fresh monuments of our greatness, monuments whose age make modern the crumbling walls of the Coliseum; we the people who antedate all others and have outlived them all—we should remain firm in our devotion to all that has given substance to these boasts, with the same faith in results that made Daniel calm and brave when he was cast among the lions. It is a solemn duty, and there the inquiry should end, but just as it is necessary to teach honesty by showing that it is the best policy, it may be proper to go further and show that as a matter of expediency it is best that we remain Jews, and to that consideration I shall address myself in the next chapter.

CHAPTER III.

Wherein is Considered the Expediency of Preserving the Existence of the Jews as Such.

In the consideration of any question of duty the welfare of others is of as much consequence as our own; in the consideration of a question of policy, our own advancement is the only end in view. Unhappy the man who regulates the progress of his life only by the law of sordid self-interest. Such a creature carries a natural impulse to an extreme that makes it unnatural. He distorts the law of self-defense into a pretended right of universal and indiscriminate war upon the world. He becomes the hated of man, the victim of God; for no love can extend to one devoid of love; no mercy be vouchsafed to him who displays none. Though it be not in the Decalogue, not less divine is the injunction: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

I am not blind to the fact that the vast majority of men are swayed by influences of both good and evil, and that while no man is perfect in virtue, no one is wholly steeped in evil. It would avail nothing to preach to men if they were either wholly good or wholly bad. In the one case it would be,

"To paint the lily
Or gild refined gold."

In the other it were "To cool the sun by fanning it with a feather."

But when men desire to do right and only go astray when they persuade themselves that what is politic is right, it is important either to show that what is politic is not right—or that what is wrong is not politic. Either effort if successful should change their course, for no good man would forsake the right from mo-

tives of policy; no intelligent man would knowingly go counter to his own interest in the exercise of a wrong.

As I have stated, to my mind it is sufficient to know that it is a solemn duty to be faithful to our traditions. But I have friends, honest and true in desire, who differ with me and who defend their position with no little power. It is contended that no particular form of religion, no adherence to particular customs is necessary to gain the favor of Heaven; that therefore it becomes simply a question for consideration, whether,

"Here upon this bank and shoal of Time,"

virtues may be practiced without regard to creeds, rites, ceremonies or customs, and that neither our religion nor our customs should be preserved unless they be shown to further our temporal welfare. In respect of that, it is urged that so far from being a benefit they are the reverse. That bigotry and oppression, persecution and outrage are stimulated against us by our exclusiveness and unity; that if we disintegrate and sacrifice our integrity as a people, intermarry with Christians, forego our little cliques, abjure the Synagogue and the rite of circumcision, oppression and bigotry, persecution and outrage will die out for want of fuel, and we will ride untrammeled on the highest wave of our modern civilization.

I have stated the position fairly and shall treat it with respectful consideration. I shall not enter into any theological discussion as to the necessity of religion in general or particular for the salvation of the soul. That is a field too full of stones and stumps for my reaper. I take direct issue with the proposition that we will be advanced morally, physically, mentally or socially by merging our existence in the common mass of mankind. For the sake of discussion I will concede, what I do not otherwise grant, that religion is of no consequence in the determination of our life beyond the grave.

I have already treated briefly of the general proposition, that in order for man to attain anything approximating universal brotherhood, he must limit his sphere to confines vastly more con-

tracted than those aimed at. It is equally true that he must, as that he should. History incontrovertibly proves that, howsoever alike different species of men be, there always must be different species, which are *genera* to other species. To illustrate let us suppose that by selection members of every species of man or any other animal were associated together in community, with equal rights, privileges and duties. Is it not evident that in a short time there would grow out of this chaos a distinct species or breed? The maturity of man is so far removed from his birth than we can only study this problem with reference to him in the pages of history; among the lower animals we can make actual observations. It requires but little experiment to show, and wider experience demonstrates that no matter how haphazard any system or want of system in breeding is conducted, out of it will grow a distinct breed. In the make-up of any old woman's poultry there may be blood of every known variety infused into the stock without selection or skill, but nevertheless in a short time her chicks can be distinguished from those of her neighbor on the adjoining farm. In the English, French, German and Spanish peoples we find a great variety of blood indiscriminately mixed without regard to results, and yet while possessing many qualities in common they are distinct in thought and feeling, physical, moral and intellectual organization, speaking different languages, governed by different laws and practicing different customs.

From these experiences we may learn this lesson, that in crossing breeds a new breed is made—that when one is extinguished by a failure to keep it pure a new strain is either formed or largely modified. Therefore if classes are undesirable nothing is gained by surrendering our particular classification. We merely make room for another, the quality of which we can not foretell. When I say another, I refer not only to those that may take an independent existence, but also those whose previous characters are modified by new infusions. Now if we are to selfishly consider the benefits we are to derive from ceasing to be Jews, it behooves us to inquire wherein we may be advantaged by crossing our breed, and by continual crossing extinguish its independent existence. I devote myself especially to the ques-

tion of blood for this reason. If we remain exclusive in our marriages we perforce must remain so to some extent in our social life; and *e converso* if we surrender our social exclusiveness we necessarily forfeit the purity of our strain by permitting mixed marriages.

> "Man is fire and woman is tow,
> Bring them together and away they go,"

and that, too, without regard to questions of religion, philosophy or social science. The Jews are famous for their intellectual power, their moral habits, their physical development and health, and their pure social intercourse with one another. It is not necessary to parade with sophomoric eloquence the exemplars of our intellectual power. The world concedes that, for their number, the Jews produce more great men than any other people on the globe. It is as readily conceded that their moral, physical and social habits and development are of the highest order—so high indeed that they have never been surpassed, and perhaps never equaled. Such a coincidence of high and noble qualities must be due to a law which if ascertainable may throw light on the question under discussion. It is a well recognized doctrine that national characters arise from a community of blood, climate, laws and customs. The same may be said of the Jews who, in some respects, constitute a nation, though they claim the globe for their country and the "Powers that be" for their rulers. If this be true, that the community of blood, customs, religion, etc., has created the Jewish character, why change the law that is fruitful of such glorious results? We are the result of a natural selection that has been going on for thousands of years. We have preserved pure a strain of blood that in the beginning was better than all others and that shows no sign of impairment. Why should we abandon methods that have placed us in the front ranks of men? The stock-raiser carefully guards the purity of his best strains, fearing that the infusion of other blood may impair the quality of his stock. Why should not we be equally jealous of ourselves? This may be claimed a harsh and unfeeling view of the matter.

It may be urged that other and higher than mere blood considerations claim attention, but may I ask whence characters grow, if not from blood and associations? Besides, in what else will we be benefited? Shall we in America have higher privileges under a Government that declares all men free and equal before the law? Shall we make more money, we who now enjoy the unenviable distinction of being a nation of money-getters? Shall we be more cultivated, educated or refined because we forfeit our birth right? Shall we be more beloved by our fellow-creatures when our consciences shall upbraid us for being openly at war with our religion and our traditions, while our Christian brothers sneer at us for being secretly faithful thereto? Shall we have to struggle less for a livelihood when we become "men of the world?" Shall we, whether we abjure religion or not, be happier because the door of a mixed society is smilingly opened in our faces and more smilingly closed on our backs?

Ah! but it is said that the name of Jew is a millstone around the neck of ambition; that it mars a career. So thought Samuel Rogers when he had Benjamin Disraeli baptized in the Church of England. Did that ceremony aid the great Jew? Was he not always in the public eye and his own esteem of the same people as his great friends, the Rothschilds? Did the people of England, the haughtiest and most addicted to caste of all the great Western powers, love Disraeli less because he championed the cause of the Jews in Servia, Bosnia, Herzogovinia, and paraded with pride through his works that he was a Jew? Turn to his contemporary, Edward Lasker, who was not reared out of his faith. Did he not rise despite his birth, and hold his hands upon the heart-strings of Germany? Contrast him with Disraeli. The latter not a Jew, except by blood, espousing the cause of the Jews amid the plaudits of the world; Lasker, a Jew in everything save heart, turning his back upon the Jews when bigotry assailed them, only to merit and receive the first condemnation expressed for him by the civilized world.

The world is cold to unwarranted claims in whatever guise they come; it is liberal to merit in any garb. The laurel grows for the Jew as for the Christian. It is true that, everything else

being equal, the Jew is at a disadvantage, because of the prejudice against the Jews as a class, but it is equally true that he who is inherently great will rise in spite of the prejudice. Certainly no one unworthy the laurel may wear it, because as to him there is no prejudice. The prejudice which prevails against a class is only an incubus in the beginning. As soon as any individual proves himself superior to the faults of his class that provoke prejudice, he is made an exception, and in being made an exception is treated with more consideration than if he did not belong to the execrated class. Unquestionably the evil reputation of the Jews injures every Jew among the Gentiles until he makes a reputation for himself, but when that reputation is made the name of Jew is honored in the man and the man honored in the name. But, I am asked, why suffer the disadvantage conceded in the outset of the race? Why not start on equal terms by giving up the name and qualities of the Jew? To this I answer that the favorite does not always win the race. He may start under more auspicious circumstances, but speed and endurance must win. Besides, the seeming disadvantage may be a blessing in disguise in that it stimulates energies that would otherwise lie dormant. It is certain that the persecutions of the Jews have developed their greatness. May it not be that the necessity for greater exertion to attain their ends was the secret of the success of the great among our people? Moreover, if we free ourselves from this disadvantage we assume others. Nature distributes her compensations as the clouds do their raindrops. A man must have some religion or none, and whichever he chooses he will find himself more or less handicapped thereby. In particular localities one religion may offer greater inducements than others, but, as a rule, it matters not what faith is professed. The race will be to the swift and enduring. A striking proof of this is found in the proverbial failure in life of the sons of great men. They start in their careers with the prestige of a great name, they enjoy the patronage of a wide circle of family friends, but when the ancestral fire is wanting the family light grows dim. If this be true of those who have a positive advantage, how true must it be of those who only enjoy the negative advantage of a free

field and a fair fight! I am convinced that every legitimate assistance in the beginning will aid in securing success at the end but an advantage or seeming advantage secured at the cost of a principle will prove a detriment before the end is reached. "The mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly fine."

Success is the reward of merit alone, and merit needs no aids that are purchased at the price of the noblest sentiments. In every department of life there is a republic of excellence, and he who possesses the highest excellence may become a president. Is the music of Meyerbeer and Mendelssohn less admired because they were Jews or the sons of Jews? Do students ignore Spinoza because he was a Jew? Does the interest flag in reading Auerbach and Heine because they were Jews? Who is it that would pluck a flower from the immortelles that grace the venerable forehead of Sir Moses Montefiore?

It is the sheerest nonsense to think that, individually, we suffer in this country because there is a prejudice against Jews. There is no prejudice against a Jew who is worthy of the name; it only extends to those who disgrace the name. A gentleman who does honor to the name derives honor from it, for

> "He gives but to receive again,
> As the seas return the rivers in rain."

The unsuccessful man is always casting about for the excuse for his failure, and the last explanation to strike him is his own deficiencies. It is a safe rule that he who lays his failure at the door of his creed or race, seeks an illegitimate parent for his own abortion.

> "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars,
> But in ourselves that we are underlings."

I do not dispute that in barbarous countries or among bigoted peoples, where the Jews are persecuted as such, there may be a positive advantage in not being a Jew. But there is no need for a utilitarian argument to such Jews. Faithful to the traditions

of the Jews, they are more adherent to their religion and their customs in adversity than in prosperity. With them it suffices to know and feel that it is right to be Jews. The suffering that grows out of the exercise of that right they leave to the God of Israel, in whose inscrutable wisdom and justice they place a sublime faith. I should not omit to mention one other disadvantage arising from the desertion of Judaism and Jewish modes of life. The renegade from any class is a marked man. He becomes a

"Fixed figure for the time of scorn
To point his slow, unmoving finger at."

The Jewish renegade is execrated by the Jews as a traitor and a coward; by the Christians as a hypocrite and a time-server. Consistency and sincerity are qualities that always excite admiration and respect. The most prominent among the respected and esteemed Jews are those who are Jews at heart and avowed Jews before the world. It may apparently avail a man to abjure his religion and his people, but it is equally true that at times there is an advantage to be derived from absolute falsehood and deception.

I trust I shall not be misunderstood as arguing that in remaining Jews it is essential that we abstain from association with non-Israelites. I hold no such views. I am in favor of intercourse, but the intercourse that I favor is as far from an indiscriminate intermixture as it is from absolute exclusion. I favor intercourse, conducted upon a sound philosophy, applied to social life. I shall have occasion to treat of that subject further on, and I only mention it now to guard against misapprehension. Thus far I have confined myself to the consideration of the single question: Shall we as Jews perpetuate our solidarity as a people preserving our faith and traditions, and our social characteristics? I have sought to show that our perpetuity depends upon ourselves; that we as a people are superior to that law of decay which affects all others. I have sought to answer the question by showing that it was a duty to do so, which if it properly might be, in fact

is not affected by any considerations of true policy. Let it be remembered that I have discussed the question thus far solely from the standpoint of the Jew—I shall later on consider it in another view.

Assuming that the question I have propounded should be answered affirmatively, I next proceed to inquire into the proper course to pursue in order to insure the integrity of the Jews.

CHAPTER IV.

Wherein is Considered the Loyalty Due to the Traditions and Customs of the Jewish Ancestors.

No problems are so difficult of solution as the problems of casuistry. When the reasoning powers are applied to the solution of delicate questions of right or wrong they utterly fail, except they derive conclusions from premises that do not properly emanate from the reasoning powers. Indeed, it may be safely announced as a sound proposition that all rules of conduct that the reason approves are deducible from the moral sense. It does not follow that the rules will or must be correct because of this fact. It is not certain that the moral sense itself has not been perverted if originally pure, and, moreover, in the process of deduction elements may creep in to defile the purity of the law. A stream may gush in crystal clearness at its head, and be a filthy volume at its mouth. The truth of the general proposition thus briefly mentioned is illustrated by the power of what we call conscience. Under some name, that element of our spiritual nature which turns to the right and from the wrong, without effort or delay, has been recognized all over the world, and at all times. Its voice is often drowned by false logic, but it is never silent. *It* seldom, if ever, errs; the reasoning faculties are as often wrong as right. Almost any act can be plausibly defended by the understanding, but when the Reason has whitewashed an escutcheon the Conscience irrepressibly points to the fact that beneath the coat of white is a dark and repelling substratum. I remember once as a student of ethics I asked our learned instructor this question: "If I saw an East Indian woman, in the exercise of her religious belief, about to cast her infant into the Ganges, should I prevent what I conceive to be a murder and deny her the exercise of her religious belief, or should I be tolerant and suffer a murder?" I should have no difficulty now in answering

the question; but then it presented difficulties to one who believed in what is popularly and erroneously called the exercise of the freedom of conscience. The professor's answer was characteristic: "I might fail to satisfactorily explain my course, but I know that my moral instincts would impel me to prevent the sacrifice, and I would do it." There are some things about which we can not reason, they are so deep; there are others about which we need not, they are so clear. Twestern said much the same thing about the existence of God.

I need not say that I believe in this moral sense. I believe that every well balanced mind acknowledges its existence.

Utilitarians may and do argue that patriotism is a virtue because it is politic, but the martyrdom that has been suffered by millions of patriots is an answer to the argument which no logic can meet. The love of country has a higher origin and a broader base than mere policy. It is true that nations are created or rather grow out of that selfishness which I have discussed already, but that selfishness is merely a longing to satisfy a want common to all mankind, implanted in us by a higher power to work out an end that we know not of. Mere logic and utilitarianism breed such apothegms as *ubi bene, ibi patria;* the moral sense breeds such heroes as Regulus and Leonidas and Arnold Winkelried. Patriotism is a virtue positive and *per se,* and hence a duty universally recognized and universally practiced. It is but a specific form of that loyalty which we owe to a higher power, upon which we depend, whence we sprung and to which we are indebted for existence, improvement and protection. Loyalty to different powers and different institutions may co-exist without conflict, for the fealty due to the one may be of a different nature to that which is due to another. The population of the United States is heterogeneous in its elements, but homogeneous in its compound. The common bond of American citizenship closes the political gap between people that by education and from nativity are widely apart; but notwithstanding this community of loyalty, the Frenchman continues to love France and hate Germany, and the German still loves Germany and hates France. It is not objected to in our country that American citizens of German birth

or extraction should celebrate great German triumphs with enthusiasm; nor that Frenchman should glow over the victories of the Little Corporal. *Die Wacht Am Rhein* and *La Marseillaise* float undisturbed on our breezes, for we know that when the national harpstrings are sounded, the Germans and the French will attune their voices to a common key and sing in harmony the "Star Spangled Banner."

There is nothing inconsistent in the Jewish reverence and love for the traditions and customs of the Jewish fathers. It is the same order of loyalty that makes the naturalized emigrant weep or rejoice in the sorrows or joys of the nation whence he sprung. It is true we have no land that we may call our own. There is not a foot of ground upon the face of the globe under absolute Jewish dominion, for even the Jewish cemeteries are parts of nations in which the Jews are citizens or subjects, independent of their being Jews. But while we have no nation in that sense we are a people distinct in ourselves, though scattered broadcast among the haunts of men. *Quam fluctus diversi, quam mare conjuncti.* Their derivation from a common source, the unparalleled purity of their blood, the sameness of their creed and traditions, the melancholy uniformity of their sufferings, the same fears and hopes, the same customs and idiosyncrasies, make the Jew of Asia Minor a compatriot of the Jew of the United States. The bond exists and it is recognized. The great centenarian, Sir Moses Montefiore, is its living exemplar.* From our shores of freedom the ships of aid and encouragement have been launched for tyrant ports, laden with good cheer and substantial offerings to our persecuted brethren abroad.

Was it wrong for us to aid the persecuted Jews in Roumania and neighboring provinces, while others busied themselves with missionary work in Central Africa? Was our loyalty misplaced? Certainly our government thought not so when at our instance it remonstrated against the outrages, and recognized our sympathetic sufferings by sending a Jewish Consul to Bucarest.*

*Written before his death in 1885.
*Benj. F. Peixotto during Grant's administration.

Our moral sense tells us that this loyalty is right, and we may reason as we please we can not uproot it. We have no Jewish nation whose laws we are called on to obey; we have no common home to improve, to love or defend; we have no temporal gvernment to support, but we have in common a past of our fathers full of suffering and triumph, patience and courage, heroism and wisdom, piety and truth; we have in common a present for ourselves, great in the growth from the seeds sown in that past; we have in common a future for our children that shall give fruition where there is but foliage now. To that past, this present and the future we owe fealty. It is a duty to the exercise of which we are admonished by the still small voice of conscience, the neglect of which will engender the bitterest remorse.

Let not this loyalty be confounded with the loyalty that the Roman Catholic pays to Rome. The Pontiff still claims a temporal power for the See and as the head of the Catholic hierarchy he rules the Catholics of the world. To the Catholics he is the Vicar of God, whose bulls are revelations from on High—and if it chances that governmental laws come in conflict with the decree of Rome the Catholic is called on as part of his religion to cling to Mother Church. Our loyalty is subject to no such objection. To compare the two is to compare opposites; the distinction between them is their entire difference from each other.

I shall not argue that it is proper to nourish this sentiment of loyalty. I have discussed it sufficiently if it be in need or will admit of argument. I assume that it should be nourished and cultivated as a virtue of the highest order. I urge this nourishment and culture as one of the means by which the Jews can be perpetuated. If we be true to the traditions of our fathers we shall live as long as filial devotion engenders self-esteem and the admiration of the world. Without our history and our lineage we are nothing, and it behooves us to cherish them more fondly than the aristocrat does his genealogy. Our family tree was rooted on creation's dawn, and destined, I trust, to flourish until the latest day.

CHAPTER V.

Wherein is Considered the State of Judaism in the United States.

I have already stated my reluctance to touch upon the subject of religion, and if I feel called on to give it some consideration, it shall be but a brief and passing notice. The discussion of our social duties would be incomplete without some mention of our religion.

It has become fashionable in America to reform "Judaism." The phrase is either absurd or inaptly chosen. The religion of the Jews can not be reformed or altered by the hand or mind of man. That would be to tinker with the handiwork of divinity. We might as well seek to alter the operations of the solar system. The practice of our religion is, however, the proper subject of change. Independent of any form of religion known to us, there are certain natural rights which occasion reciprocal duties. The observance of the duties which grow out of the rights of others is the religion common to all. Differences have arisen as to the best mode of practicing the duties we owe to one another, and as each mode materializes and gains supporters it takes upon itself the name of a distinct religion. In so far as each teaches the exercise of correct principles each is divine and may not be altered; in so far as they adopt or practice methods of instruction they are perhaps all human. Judaism has no broader limits than the tablets on which were inscribed the Decalogue. Who obeys the Commandments is a Jew so far as religion is concerned. It has been found, however, that just as it requires a criminal code to prevent crimes against governments, so it requires religions to prevent violations of the Ten Commandments, and to encourage the practice of the positive virtues, which are expressed in or implied from them.

It has been shown that man is actually selfish. This quality in its normal condition is a virtue, but under the corrupting influence of our animal appetites it is in constant danger of be-

coming a grave fault. Once developed in its unnatural vigor by animal wants or desires, it clouds the reason and deadens the conscience, until our natural duties are forgotten or wilfully disregarded. To counteract this tendency, churches have been built, so that under the melting influence of "fretted arch and long drawn aisle," selfish ends may be forgotten and natural duties become prominent. We are all subject to the effect called enthusiasm—that frenzy of the mind to which we are indebted for the greatest triumphs of mankind. The bravest soldiers will lose courage if they are denied the inspiration of music and the national flag; the veriest coward glows with courage when he hears his comrades cheer a response to the martial music of the drum and fife. Orators infuse into the most apathetic an interest in public affairs by arousing their enthusiasm. Religious fervor is a powerful agent in bringing about the practice of virtue and the avoidance of sin. The ceremonies and forms most calculated to produce the desired end have everywhere been adopted, and as different people require different rites, ceremonies and forms to make them fervid with virtuous desire, different forms of religion have arisen in different portions of the globe. The Oriental people require peculiar forms, etc., which are supplied by Buddhism and Mohammedanism. Europe is supplied by the various forms of Christianity. As times change and the world advances or retrogrades, changes are necessary in ceremonies, rites, etc., hence the importance in every church of an hierarchy, whence may be derived authority for such modifications as are required. In the absence of such government confusion must predominate, and chaos will supervene. Instance the Christian churches. Under Rome and the Czar there is uniformity in two of the branches, but the departure inaugurated by Luther and Calvin has bred a multitude of churches having little in common but their origin and the essentials of their creeds. It is said that churches breed half the world's troubles. This is a mistake. It is the difference among churches that gives rise to contention—not their existence. Were there but one church it would doubtless be corrupt in its ministers, but it could not be bellicose. A multitude of churches insures a clean ministry and

a belligerent spirit. What is the proper mean between these extremes, is not my province to discuss. What I am leading to is the proposition that a multitude of churches to practice the same creed under different forms, engender such confusion, contention and strife that the creed itself is in danger. Thus children in contending for a toy nearly always destroy the subject matter of controversy before the title is established.

Forms of religion must change with men and conditions. The *forms* of Judaism are no exception. I am not opposed to the conservative and gradual alteration of ceremonies that should fall, as many have fallen, into desuetude; but reform does not mean revolution. In trimming off unnecessary foliage from our church tree, let us guard against hacking down the tree itself. We have no real hierarchy, and may be said to have had none since the Sanhedrin—consequently the "reforms" are not uniform. The result could be easily forecast were it not already foregone. Each Jewish minister is a free-lance, and each is ambitious to originate something new, an achievement that he thinks is accomplished by destroying something old. They are fettered by nothing but traditions and each has his pruning-knife whetted anxious to cut off a more substantial limb than his neighbor. The fashion is little over a quarter century old in America and the poor old tree is so bare of limbs and foliage already that it is scarcely recognizable. When I see the work of such men as Felix Adler I am reminded of the similarity between them and Gloster, who thought that:

> "The aspiring youth who fired the Ephesian dome
> Outlives the pious fool who reared it."

Can we do nothing to stop this desecration? Can we not fetter the inconoclasm of these ruthless destroyers?

Lord Bacon, in his essay on Innovation says, "It is good also not to try experiments except the necessity be urgent or the utility evident; and well to beware that it be the reformation that draweth on the change, and not the desire of change that pretendeth the reformation, and lastly, that the novelty, though it be

not rejected, yet be held for a suspect, and as the Scripture sayeth, 'That we make a stand upon the ancient way and then look about us and discover what is the straight and right way and so to walk in it.' "

Let us pause for a while and consider the present indifference to the forms and ceremonies of our religion in its relations to the righteous conduct of the people. The present reform movement as expounded by its leaders, is an effort to reduce religion to a rational basis, and to reject everything that cannot be reconciled with the understanding of its adherents. In the nature of things a platform so narrow affords no room for traditional customs, forms and ceremonies, nor does it extend a habitat for the miracles narrated in the Scriptures. That this reform movement must eventuate in a failue, seems to my mind so clear that it requires but little argument to show it. Were the movement of an intelligent and conservative character, directed to eliminating and altering some of the obsolete and ineffective forms of our worship, and were it the result of a desire common to the mass of the people, the success of it would be immediate and its course unaffected by anything in the nature of revolution. But an effort to rationalize religion is an absurdity upon its face. The very phrase, "A rational religion," as interpreted by those who coined it, involves a contradiction of terms. A creed formulated for the government of the world in its moral aspect, which is not based either in revelation or tradition, can have no firm foundation. Reason is neither deep enough nor broad enough to support a structure of such towering height and such ponderous weight. The decalogue is conceded to be the best moral code ever yet promulgated for the government of the world, and so-called rationalists uphold and maintain every syllable contained in that wonderful revelation. If the divine character of the commands be disputed, but the truth and worth of them maintained, it behooves the rationalists to furnish an affirmative argument in favor of each of said commands. Can this be done? Is it possible to establish by pure logic, and from premises which require no resort to tradition or revelation, the truth of any sentence in the decalogue? It is a startling challenge, and yet I

make it without fear of a satisfactory reply, that it is impossible by mere argument, independent of the Scriptures or tradition, to establish the correctness of any law laid down in the commandments.

For example, what will the rationalist say in support of the command "Thou shalt not kill?" Where will he find the premise upon which to base a train of reasoning leading to such a conclusion? Will he find it in the nature of man? Will he find it in the course of nature that surrounds and environs mankind? Will he find it in the animal instincts which observation teaches him exist in the human organism? Will he find it by analogy from the brute creation? Most assuredly not.

If he lowers his gaze from the skies and looks about him and at his feet, he will find nothing to warrant the interdict against homicide. He will find that the animals prey upon one another, that the birds of the air and the fish of the sea prey upon one another; he will find that man in his primitive natural state engages in almost ceaseless warfare against his kind; that might is recognized as the only standard of right; that there exists no conscience in the savage which gives rise to remorse because of the slaughter of a fellow being. Nay, more, he finds that the savage satisfies his hunger by using the corpse of his human victim as his daily food. If he argues that the institution of society cannot exist if homicide be permissible, the reply comes swift to the surface, that society supervenes the nature of man and is the creature of mankind, not man the creature of society, and if society requires an absolute change in the nature of man in order to render its existence possible, then is society falsely based. Again, what argument is offered by anything in nature in favor of the right of property and in support of the interdict against theft? Do we not find that the animals seize what they have the power to take, and retain what they have the power to hold? Is not this true of the birds and of the fishes? Is it not true of man in his primitive and natural state? Is it not true, even according to the theory of the evolutionist, that the fittest survive because of their fitness, and because by reason of their fitness they are able to enjoy those things which are necessary to

sustenance, and thus are the unfit deprived of them. Nature presents a continual round of thefts justified apparently by the divine economy. It is only man who is forbidden to steal, and why this distinction if it be not founded upon some broader and deeper basis than mere reason. I might go through with all of the commandments and show that none of them can be sustained upon mere and purely logical grounds.

Surely a religion can have but little claim for respect if it denies the divine character of the decalogue and yet fails to establish the commandments upon some other basis than that furnished by the Scriptures.

The new school further maintains that the practice of mere forms and ceremonies is neither essential to salvation, nor to the practice of morality and hence it is permissible to abrogate all forms and ceremonies that do not consist with contemporary ideas. I propose to consider this proposition, for it involves an error that has become exceedingly popular. I copy here some reflections upon this matter prepared at another time and which were delivered in a public lecture.

"Religion, in its generic sense, has been defined as the recognition of God, as an object of worship, love and obedience. Without regard to differences in creeds, a system of devotion which fulfils the conditons of the definiton may be termed a religion—and without regard to incidental errors in the system, if it be based upon a recognition of one God, as the fountain of existence and authority and the object of adoration, love and obedience, to that extent the particular religion is true. The object of every religion should be to elevate the morality and thus insure the happiness of its devotees. To this end all other aims must become subservient, as they are naturally subordinate and incidental. Religion considered as a means to the attainment of a pure life is divisible into two main aspects—to-wit: faith and practice. Faith deals with matters existent, and upon it is predicated rules of human conduct. Practice is the conduct regulated by the rules derived from faith.

The recognition of God as an object of worship, love and obedience and as the fountain of existence and authority to which

we are accountable is matter of faith—and he who makes such recognition possesses religion to that extent. Such faith, however, may be conceived as coexistent in the same individual, with the most immoral practices. Whenever, in fact, a wilful wrong is committed, we have an exhibition of practice which is at variance with faith. Morality may possibly be practiced without faith in those matters which constitute religion proper, although no system of practical morality could be founded without reference to some supernatural and final authority. The inquiry is not so practically important as the manner and means of practicing morality. The vast majority of mankind possess religion pure and proper. That is to say they recognize God as an object or worship, love and obedience, and as the source of all existence and authority. It is equally true that the great majority of those possessing this religion desire to practice morality. At this point, however, the ground ceases to be common and the roads fork in a thousand different directions.

There are those who claim that not only is faith an essential in the scheme of salvation, but that the practice of forms and ceremonies are indispensable either to morality on earth or safety hereafter. This class embraces all of those who, claiming truth in faith and practice for themselves, consign all others to perdition.

There are those who believe that practical morality is necessarily based upon religion as already defined, and that when morality thus founded and derived is attained, the essential obligations of life, have been complied with. This, as I understand it, is the essence of Judaism as a religion. To characterize Judaism by reference to its peculiar forms and practices rather than by the essentials just named, is to confound a name used in classification, with the very substance itself.

Such an analysis of Judaism—the reduction of it as it were to its elements—has not always been and is not productive of unmixed good. False logic leads as often to error when the premises are true as when they are incorrect. Since pure Judaism does not make mere matters of form and ceremony—mere rites and rituals—essential to salvation, the hasty reasoner concludes

that he may abandon them without peril either to the happiness of his existence in the unknown hereafter, or to the morality of his conduct in this earthly span of life. It is to this not unpopular—this plausible and dangerous fallacy that I desire to especially direct attention.

It may be conceded for the sake of argument, if demanded, that a man whose thoughts are always pure and whose feelings are always natural and noble and whose deeds are always good and who believes in Monotheism attains to the highest aims of Judaism, without reference to whether he complies or not with mere matters of church discipline or practices the forms and ceremonies which serve in a measure to distinguish the professors of Judaism, from the members of other churches. Such a concession might perhaps be demanded, as a logical issue of the Judaistic scheme.

But it is the boldest error to assume because of such a base possibility, that no convincing reason remains for the preservation and practice of rites and ceremonies. Man is a complex organization. He is both animal and spiritual. He is both rational and emotional. He acquires knowledge, both by intuition and by induction. He has desires that spring from calculation and from mere sensation. He is impressionable both by influences that would affect natures purely animal and by those that would move natures purely spiritual. His conduct is actuated by mere feeling, emotion and impulse, or by deliberate design founded on ratiocination. In dealing with such a complicated organization all its parts must be considered. If men were free from all animal qualities they could be governed without any systematized code of laws other than would be furnished by or evolved out of their very constitution. If they were purely animals, they could be controlled solely by their appetites and their fears.

Every well regulated system of civil government recognizes and provides for the phenomena due to this dual nature of man. A code of human laws that treats of men as mere brutes inevitably leads to revolution, because it is unbearably cruel; the code that regards them as angels results in anarchy, because it is

wanting in the strength requisite for order. A pure despotism is only possible where the people have not reached to the full stature of manhood; Utopia is only possible when the people have risen above it.

To commit murder is a crime. It is a crime whether forbidden by the law of the land or not and being thus forbidden does not make it more a crime. Every well balanced mind will admit so simple a proposition. If then it be regarded by all as a crime, why forbid it? Or to go a step further, why interdict the carrying of concealed weapons? The answer is simple enough. Man has that element in his nature which makes it unsafe to rely solely upon his knowledge of the right and his desire to practice it. His conduct must necessarily be goverened in great measure by his feelings.

Far be it from me to enhance without warrant, the dignity of the emotional part of our nature, but I should be blind if I did not recognize that when all is said and done, the world is governed, careers are made or blasted, happiness is secured or lost, mainly by the emotions of men.

The greatest events of history have been and always will be the result of sentiment. No amount of education can eradicate from human nature, the potent influence of the heart as contradistinguished from the mind. No man is above it. When in the history of Rasselas we read of the sage who claims that he has found happiness in the elimination from his nature of all emotion, we discover an appropriate anti-climax in his grief over the death of his child. Nothing illustrates the proposition better than the death of one that is near and dear. Are you a philosopher who reasons that since death is inevitable, grief is unwise and unmanly? Have you steeled yourself against the heartaches that weaklings feel when the grim destroyer stands at the bedside of their beloved ones? If so carry your philosophy always with you. Take it to the cradle of your expiring child. Watch its fluttering pulse and dying gasps, close the eyelids in their last long sleep, compose the rigid little limbs and turn away. In such a moment can the shield of philosophy keep from your breast

the shafts of anguish? Believe it not. The bosom will shake and the tears will fall, none the less freely because in vain.

And will you say that such experiences are unproductive of results on human conduct? Is there a man so constituted as to be impervious to feeling? One whose breast is unmoved by grief or joy, by love, admiration, awe or adoration? Search the wide world over and there is not one. The great painters of human nature all move their characters by their feelings. To substitute any other motive power would be infidelity to nature.

But feelings do not operate on the abstract. They must be in contact with the objects upon which they are exercised or they will not respond. They must be moved by some influence before they in turn give direction to human conduct. It requires no argument to demonstrate that if the emotions are improperly moved, they will operate in the wrong direction and thus effectuate a positive wrong. And further that if not properly aroused they will become dormant and thus omit the performance of what is right. Consequently there can be no doubt that every individual who desires to practice morality, should always seek to subject his feelings to proper and to shield them from evil influences. And the most boastful of those who claim that they are capable of doing the right without extraneous influence, are daily governed by influences that proceed from without. Let me illustrate. Take a man who claims that he knows what is right and that he always does it without pressure of any kind. Such a man will surely admit that such charity as he is able to dispense, is a duty. Go to him dressed in purple and fine linen and solicit money for a family of starving children. Perchance his heart will not beat a throb faster as he mechanically gives you a contribution and when you have left him the subject passes from his mind. Yet this man has done a charity. Now, if you can, lead this man to the hovel to see the pale faced, hollowed-eyed little ones. Let him hear their piteous cries. Bring him face to face with the misery and behold the change. The heart beats high in his breast; his eye dim and with a feeling of intense gratification he relieves the sufferers. This, too, is

only a charity, but it is as much purer than the first, as a living rose is purer than a painted counterfeit.

And thus in our everyday life we are governed by subtle influences which we cannot see, but which impel us to evil or lead us to good. The play, the opera, the books we read, the conversations we engage in, the company we keep, the landscape we see, the very air we breathe all move us to become better or worse. Nothing is so potent for good as devotion. Voltaire, who scoffed at all religion, recognized the good influence of churches. The very thought that in our devotions, we design to cast off all evil considerations and bend our minds and hearts to the contemplation of all that is true, beautiful and good in God's creation works upon the dormant elements of our natures, as the sun does upon the buried seed. The strains of solemn music, the pure sentiments that emanate fom the pulpit, elevate the spirit and strengthen the determination to practice what we believe. The prayers we utter and that we hear our children breathe, the traditional feasts and fasts of our people, made holy as it were by their hoary antiquity lead us up to the consideration of duties that we would otherwise ignore. It is not that the chanting of a hymn or the uttering of a formal prayer will of themselves make us good and pure; but the music and the prayer, the festival and fast cause us to think of higher and better things and thus elevate our natures. It follows that the practice of forms of religion becomes influential in the ratio of the attention with which the forms are observed. When the mind and heart are bent to consider why and wherefore certain forms are carried out and what they are designed to symbolize, we then rise from the concrete to the abstract, and are enabled to think of the purely spiritual by means of what is tangible or visible. The mind is unequal to pure abstract truth. Who can think of charity, without also thinking of an object upon whom or which it is to be bestowed? Who can think of filial duty without at the same time thinking of parent and child? We only rise to the contemplation of human virtues by the contemplation of their manifestations. Thus the greatest teachers of morality taught by parables.

When the attention does not become fixed, the practice loses much, but not all of its virtue. Attention is one thing; intention is another. In the illustrations already cited of the two aspects of a charity we can see the distinction. In one aspect there was a formal and I might say unfeeling contribution. Here was a want of attention. In the other instance the relief was given with a compassionate tear and a tender heart. Here was both attention and intention. Yet while there is a difference in degree of merit, both acts were good. So in the observance of forms of religion. Let us take the Day of Atonement for the sake of illustration. It is common to hear men say that they have no faith in the efficacy of fasting. That it is nonsense to suppose that abstinence from food and drink for twenty-four hours can clear them of sin. Hence they do not fast. But they do not stop here. Since they do not fast, they deem it manly and courageous to boast of the fact that they do not observe the holiday in that respect. Such hardihood naturally leads to abstinence from the prayers appropriate to the solemn day. The prayer book remains closed and perhaps even the synagogue is not attended. The next step is the pursuit of his usual occupation, and lo! what started out to be a simple denial of the efficacy of fasting winds up in a practical denial of the doctrine of penitence. And such a man claims to believe in God and would resent as an insult the slightest imputation upon his desire to be moral. He boasts that he can be and is moral without such trumpery practice. He does not keep any holiday because, as he argues, if I do not keep *Kippur* day it would be hypocrisy to keep any other holy. Finally he eschews all religion and allows his moral nature to depend upon his own boasted understanding and the chance influences of everyday life. And perhaps he grows and thrives. But may it not be said that his is the growth and thrift of the weed that flourishes in marshy ground and deadly atmosphere, while the flower requires constant attention to develop its perfection?

I pity the creature that is unable to think of his sins with sorrow. I pity the creature who is unwilling to compel his mind and heart to contemplate his own shortcomings and who to that

end will not sacrifice a physical comfort. There is no Jew who does not understand the significance of the *Kippur* day. Every Jewish child knows what it means. It is only the stiff-necked fool who predicates an argument upon the intrinsic virtue of fasting. He knows in his own heart that no saving power is attributed to mere abstinence from food and drink. He knows that the day is set apart for the contemplation and reparation of the wrongs we have done, to consider our sins, to repent of them and to make resolution for a better life. He knows as you and I and all of us know that fasting is merely an incident. That it is a means of bending our minds to holy thoughts. That by the abjuration of physical comforts we symbolize our design and desire to minify the animal and magnify the spiritual in our nature. Is it not a notable thing to do? Is it not beautiful to contemplate that on that day throughout the world nearly six million Jews have turned their backs on all worldly matters. That they are contemplating their sins and repenting, that enmities cease, reconciliations are effected, forgiveness extended and revenge abandoned? Let me not be understood as claiming that all who fast and pray become good thereby. Perhaps on the morrow the carnival of sin will with many begin a new career. But who can measure the good that penitence does even among the depraved—and who shall say that many are not altogether led to higher and better things by the contemplation amidst such solemnity of their own corrupt past.

"I hold it truth, with him who sings,
To one clear harp in divers tones,
That men may rise on stepping stones
Of their dead selves to higher things."

And there is virtue in the mere intention to observe this day. Though the poor sinner may not be able to bring his lips to prayer, or his tongue to the utterance of penitence, yet by subjecting himself to the discomforts or sufferings of abstinence he evidences an intention to observe the traditions of his fathers, to observe his religion, to worship his God, to atone for his sins.

And such an intention thus expressed, though coupled with no attention to the true spirit of the occasion, elevates the man to as high a level as he can reach, and in the end he perchance will learn the nobler lesson of spiritual penance and devotion.

The forms and ceremonies of religion necessarily change with times and conditions of life. But while they obtain they should be observed and practiced; for a disregard of form and ceremony inevitably leads to a disregard of substance, and the observance of them naturally leads to the contemplation of the morality which they teach and which we are thus reminded to practice.

A flag flying at the masthead of a ship is only a piece of rag unworthy in itself of a serious thought; but when that ship is an American vessel and the flag our national banner, we would guard the worthless rag with our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor. The flag is our emblem and love for it and the protection we give it, is the form in which we practice our patriotism. So long as we guard it from insult our nation is safe from foreign aggression; let us become indifferent to its fate because it is only a piece of bunting and how long would it be before the tread of a foreign foe would echo in the National Capitol?

These fasts and festivals, rites and ceremonies are the means of attaining the practice of morality. They serve that end and as we love the end they serve, we should honor and observe the means by which we accomplish that end. The man who irreverently boasts of his diregard of them may attain the reputation of strong-mindedness among the weak and indifferent, but in the eyes of all good men, Jew and Gentile, and in the eyes of God, he is like unto the traitor who would drag his country's flag in the dust, to show how little he cares for a mere rag."

It is necessary to meet and overcome the desecrating spirit of those who lay their ruthless hands upon everything that is sacred in our history and our religion.

Already the conservative Jews are drawing back in alarm. They recognize that we are no longer inspired with noble thoughts and virtuous resolves by our religious gatherings. The cold sermons and classic concerts that distinguish the Amer-

ican synagogues arouse no religious fervor, and our children, too consistent to attend other churches and repelled by our own, are growing up in ignorance not only of Jewish ceremonies but also of Jewish faith. It will not do to say that if the principles be practical no forms need be followed. It is true that the latter are secondary to the former, just as garments are secondary to the persons they protect and adorn, but abolish the forms or cast away the garments and the principles and persons to which they are secondary will freeze to death. Civilization and enlightenment do not make us superior to the aid of enthusiasm in the practice of virtue. The French logicians claim to formulate a complete code of moral laws without the assistance of religion, but even the cynical Voltaire confessed that "if we had no churches we must needs build them." We can not live in the rare atmosphere of pure thought. We must have the oxygen and nitrogen of feeling or we expire. We have advanced in many things, but in morals we are the same as ever. We live, we sin, we suffer, repent and die, and so it will be to the end. I lose patience with the shallow fools who boast of *"our* nineteenth century civilization" as doing away with the "superstitions of religion." In what have we become civilized? It is true we have perfected all kinds of machinery, we have facilitated commerce by rapid transportation and communication, etc., *ad libitum,* but is crime less frequent, are wars less bloody, sufferings less acute, misery less prominent and universal? Oh, shame to the boaster, when it is remembered that to-day there are millions who are persecuting the Jews in civilized Europe. Shame to the boast that ignores the Tisza-Ezlar trial! Shame to the boast that is flaunted in the eyes of those who see nihilism and socialism honeycombing the social structure of all Europe.

We are not and never will be above the need of religion. It controls us in spite of our reasoning powers, however profound we may be. The greatest thinkers have been ruled through their feelings. The delicate touch of a woman's hair has changed the fate of nations by influencing the heart of the greatest and most powerful men. Shall it be said then that we are not amenable to the influence of the solemn yet sweet sur-

roundings of the temples where we unite in prayer to Israel's God. The veriest unbeliever can not remain unaffected amid such influences, and though he scoffs at our God, he will be swifter because of those influences to worship God by his deeds.

We must perpetuate our religion. To perpetuate it we must stop this wholesale and indiscriminate desecration of its forms. It is much easier, however, to point out evils than to prescribe remedies. It is easy to say what should not be done, but extremely difficult to indicate what should be done. I venture, however, to make some suggestions here which occur to me as being the solution of the problem presented by the apparent or real conflict between some of our forms and practices, and the remarkable progress of our present age.

As has already been remarked, mere forms and ceremonies, not being essential to salvation, and being after all merely the means by which the human heart or soul is brought to the recognition of its duties, these forms and practices are the proper subject of change whenever such change becomes necessary in order to effectuate the true objects for which the forms and practices were instituted. The experience of the world proves beyond any question that they cannot be entirely dispensed with. I do not propose to engage any further in the discussion of that proposition.

Forms and ceremonies must naturally change, but how, and when, and by what authority? Is it not best to follow the scriptural injunction, "Thus saith the Lord, stand ye in the ways and see and ask for the old paths where is the good way, and walk therein and ye shall find rest for your souls."—Jer. vi, 16.

Changes should be made only in deference to a universal demand and only because the old forms by reason of adventitious circumstances have ceased to be effective, but no one should arrogate to himself the right to determine when the emergency exists for the inauguration of such a change. Innovations should always be made with the greatest circumspection. It is often better to endure the evils that we are accustomed to than by precipitation engage in some novelty that perhaps will end in greater embarrassment than that sought to be escaped. To

make intelligent and conservative changes in our rituals, in our ceremonies and our rites, it should be recognized as necessary, first, to have a consensus of opinions that such a change as is proposed is not only expedient, but requisite, and, second, that such changes be made by some recognized authority. Such an authority is a necessity both to ascertain what is necessary and to determine how such necessities may be provided for. Where and how shall such an authority be created? In Germany and France, as has been remarked before, there is something in the nature of a Jewish hierarchy, inasmuch as the rabbis are supported by the state and are governed *inter sese* by the prescriptions of their Sanhedrins or synods. A synod of rabbis in America would perhaps attain the desired end, but it is not easy to convene such a body. Each rabbi being independent of the rest, it is next to an impossibility to obtain from them all a surrender of their individual views so that they might all stand upon the platform of historic Judaism and then proceed as a body to bring about such reformations as are necessary, and such only. I would propose that the American rabbis should form an association recognizing Judaism in its conservative and orthodox forms; recognizing the Jewish creed and the Jewish religion proper as something too sacred for human hands to touch; but recognizing mere rites, forms and ceremonies as the proper subject for intelligent change, so as to make them conform to the spirit of the age and thus increase their effectiveness. Such changes, however, should be made gradually and not with a mere desire of change, and only as necessity demands. Such an association or synod should create from among its members a central authority to pass upon mere matters of discipline during the intervals between the convention of the whole body. Such an organization could entertain propositions to bring about such changes as are needed and such only, and no innovation should be recognized as being in consonance with Judaism, except made under the sanction of some such authority. Thus would the occupation of the free lance in the pulpit come to a most timely end, and our sacred religion, which has

been the target for so many treacherous marksmen, stand once more in her ancient dignity before her children.

This is a bare suggestion of mine and one to which I am by no means wedded. Perchance some other plan might be proposed that would cause me to renounce the one I have mentioned. Perhaps, even in the absence of any substitute being offered, I would yield to argument against the feasibility of mine.

I should, perhaps, not leave this subject without a more complete discussion of the remedies which I propose for the evils I point out, but I will be excused when it is considered that it is the duty of the people to demand the remedy and of the rabbis to supply it. It would be presumptuous in me to formulate a plan of procedure. It must arise from a multitude of minds after the exchange of ideas. It is our province to recognize our want and firmly demand a uniform mode of worship, which while conforming to the times and our conditions shall not so far trench upon traditional methods as to be entirely dissimilar from the practices of our ancestors. What we desire we know, what we need we must ascertain, what will answer our needs let our church leaders supply.

CHAPTER VI.

Wherein is considered the Intermarriage of Jews and Gentiles.

It has been shown, I trust, that the preservation of the Jews as a people is due in a large measure to the veneration they have displayed for their traditions and their religion, and the continuance of this veneration has been urged as a powerful means for perpetuating the integrity of the Jews as a people. There is another cause, however, which must not be overlooked. The Jews have preserved the purity of their blood. If that has been a virtue, it was one born of necessity, rather than choice. Until a period within the memory of men still living there was scarcely if any country on the face of the globe in which race prejudice had became so faint as to permit of intermarriages between Jews and Gentiles. But of late years, and especially in America, it has become possible for the Jews to pass upon the question as a matter of choice, instead of accepting, as heretofore, a solution dicated by necessity. Being now, to a greater or lesser degree, a matter of choice, it becomes important to consider the question, shall Jews confine themselves to their own race in matrimony? My views will be understood before I express them. I am of the opinion that the question should be answered in the affirmative. The reasons which lead me to that conclusion will prove more interesting, however, than the bare opinion itself.

The young and the impulsive are apt to argue that love is supreme in dictating the selection of husband or wife. That nature intended man and woman to mate, and inspired individuals with a passion which directs and brings about a proper union; that it is worldly and unnatural to deny the heart its choice because of any conventional or politic reason, and being unnatural is wrong.

The argument may seem puerile to practical people, but, inasmuch as it is so generally accepted and urged, it merits some consideration.

Nature, or rather the Creator, provided for the perpetuation of the human family by making sensual love and philoprogenitiveness integral parts of human nature. These are qualities that are common to all animals. Upon this fact is based the claim that nature's promptings should govern in the choice of husband or wife. The vice of the argument lies in the disregard of the distinction between lust and love. One is purely an animal desire; the other is the offspring, or rather union, of animal passion and the more divine affections, such as admiration, respect, or esteem. If the mere animal passions should govern man as they do the brute in the selection of his mate, no answer could be made to the argument, but the very institution of marriage itself repels such a suggestion. The lower animals have no guides but their passions, and have no limits to their constancy or continence but their desires. We, however, recognize an obligation incumbent upon us to cleave unto the partners of our beds until death the tie doth sever. It is not my purpose to discuss marriage either from a political or religious standpoint. It is immaterial whether we consider the marriage rite as a sacrament God-ordained, or simply a civil contract, indissoluble save on the grounds of public policy. In either aspect the obligations assumed are of life-long duration, and the consequences following their assumption of the most solemn nature. Marriage has been said to be "a fit nursery for the commonwealth," and in this aspect it lies at the foundation of government. But beyond and underlying this it is the one and only substantial basis of society. It insures the education of the human family by making certain the parentage of the young. It strengthens and perpetuates parental and filial affection by the constant associations and reciprocal duties engendered by the family relation. Around it are clustered, in it are enfolded, from it emanates every human virtue that makes man the connecting link between the brute and the angel.

Such a solemn, such an enduring relation should not be lightly entered into. No mere sexual desire, no impulse, no feelings inspired by physical charms, should alone be permitted to govern the choice of a partner in the marriage state. The keen

edge of youthful appetites wears but too soon away. The duration is in the inverse ratio of its keenness. Unhappy indeed are those who unite their destinies upon so fragile a foundation. For when time has cooled the hot blood of youth and the judgment comes into play nothing may be left upon which to build or maintain the happiness of home. The profoundest depths of the mind should be sounded, the ripest powers of judgment exercised and the most careful display of taste made, in the choice of husband or wife. It is absurd to say that love is blind and the heart can not be governed by the head. The most charming of all young men and women are to be found among those recently married, for the reason that the most charming in any age or society are as a rule first married. Now, if it were true that the heart is ungovernable, would it not follow that every young wife or husband must have scores of desperate and heart-broken lovers whose mania supervened the marriage? And is it not true that no honest man or woman ever indulges the idea of being enamored of another's wife or husband as the case may be?

To confess an inability to control one's passion by pride, duty or propriety, is to admit that one is more animal than human. There is something sublime in the old song:

"I could not love thee half so much,
Loved I not Honor more."

The natural or logical proposition deducible from such premises as I have mentioned is plain. When considerations of duty and propriety are equal let the impulses of the heart, or body if you will, make the choice of a mate; if duty or propriety stand in the way of such a choice, do not make it. Let me not be understood as advocating the *marriage de convenance.* It is as much to be decried as the marriage on impulse or passion. I strongly and emphatically uphold the good old custom of allowing the young folks to make their own selections subject to the approval of their natural guardians.

Returning now to the subject proper of this chapter, it re-

mains to be seen if there be any considerations of duty or propriety which should preclude the intermarriage of Jews and Gentiles. If there be none, mere race prejudice should not be allowed to interfere. As I understand the Jewish religion there is no inhibition in its laws against the intermarriage of a Jew with a Christian, therefore I can not trace any objection on that score. Wherein then lies the obstacle? Theoretically, or rather in the abstract, there is none—man and woman were designed to procreate, and whether Jew or Gentile, if otherwise equal, all men and women stand on a parity before God, and in this country, before the law. Theoretically and in the abstract, the same reasoning applies to marriages between the negroes and the Caucasians. Save for some local restrictions in the latter case, the parallel is perfect. But our law-makers in many States have for manifest reasons prohibited, with heavy penalties, the offense of miscegenation. It is certainly no more of a *malum per se* than a marriage between a Spaniard and an Irishman, but it is made a *malum prohibitum* because of its frightful consequences. It is unnecessary to dwell upon or elaborate the political and social disturbances that would follow the practice of miscegenation. They are too apparent to need discussion.

I do not pretend, of course, that marriages between Jews and Gentiles would be equally prolific of misfortune. Politically such marriages would have but little or no influence, but I do maintain that in social relations they would bring about, as a rule, what they now accomplish in isolated cases, an unhappy state of affairs. Look at the home that grows out of such a union. Around the hearthstone there is religious strife or the callous indifferance in religious matters, that is the only price of peace. Beneath the roof-tree, uncongenial and opposing relations meet to scowl or sneer at each other. The doors of all society are open to such a family as a matter of necessity or politeness, but none have "welcome" as a greeting. The children grow up without any religious training of the heart or with what is more common and unfortunate, a contempt for religion growing out of the home surroundings and parental examples. In

the nature of things, some of the children will follow the religion and people of one parent, while others will travel the opposite road, and thus is severed the natural tie that makes the fraternal relation so beautiful to behold and so fruitful of good. Society is deeply interested in such unions, for they are made at the expense of society.

I have not overdrawn the picture. If anything, I have done it scant justice. All the evils I have named and a thousand others flow from such mixed marriages, and these evils are the price of a brief indulgence in animal pleasures. I do not gainsay that there are exceptions to the rule. They prove rather than disprove the rule itself. In rare cases such marriages are happy and result in a worthy and affectionate offspring; in rarer cases still such marriages are justifiable. In remote countries, sparsely populated, the choice may be between such marriages and a worse relation. In such a case the selection is plain, but under ordinary circumstances, it seems to me clear that Jews should avoid marriages with Gentiles and Gentiles with Jews, upon the same principle that we avoid marrying the insane, the consumptive, the scrofulitic or the negro. We marry for the advancement of our happiness in life and to procreate offspring. In transmitting life we should do so in such manner and under such circumstances that our offspring may have a life worth living. In taking a step which is to affect our happiness, we should take it with reference to our happiness to the end of our lives, else we may barter the noon and evening of our days for a few hours of bliss at dawn. The prudent traveler in crossing a desert does not drain his flask to assuage his thirst at the outset, but husbands every drop with rare calculation to make the supply reach to the journey's end.

The argument I have offered on this subject is more comprehensive than the subject itself, for it applies to all ill-assorted unions. It addresses itself entirely to the understanding; it is entirely utilitarian. Besides this argument *ab inconvenienti* to the Jew there is another growing out of the general duty that he owes to his people. If it be a duty of the Jews to preserve the solidarity of the Jews as a people, it is the duty of every Jew

to contribute to that end. It is manifest that nothing would operate so surely to disintegrate the Jews as intermarriage with other peoples. It is not always true that majorities absorb and assimilate minorities. The Jews are a striking exception. But if the barriers of distinction are thrown down complete assimilation must ensue. Take away the influence of Jewish surroundings and education, and Jewish children will grow up as heathens or Christians. Lord Beaconsfield and Mendelssohn, the musician, are prominent proofs of this fact. The former, especially, was proud of his lineage, but he was a Christian by belief and at heart, because from infancy he was taught to believe in the religion of the Christians.

One of the regulations of the Roman Catholic Church limits the marriages of its members to professors of that faith, save in certain excepted cases. The avowed reason of the rule is to perpetuate the religion by insuring the education of children in the Church. The regulation is founded in that great wisdom which characterizes the government of the most systematic institution that has ever existed. From the Catholic standpoint the regulation is positively good; from no standpoint is it objectionable except that the Church itself is an evil. So too from the Jewish standpoint it is a virtue to abstain from mixed marriages; from no standpoint is the abstinence objectionable unless it be true that the world would be better if we ceased to exist as Jews. I shall consider that problem further on, and I trust I shall make it plain that the world would suffer by the assimilation of a people to whose distinctive existence and the fruits thereof it owes so much of its progress, government and happiness.

CHAPTER VII.

Wherein is Considered the Education of Jewish Children.

There was a time when gentlemen were thankful that they could not read or write, but such indifference to the advantages of education no longer exists. I need not, therefore, offer any arguments to convince my readers that they should educate their children. It is unfortunate that experience has not shown the best mode of education, as well as it has proven education to be an advantage. No more difficult problem has ever taxed the human mind than the proper method of education for the young. The greatest thinkers have bent their thoughts to the subject, but it still defiantly issues its challenge to the philosopher. Education is analogous to government. In fact, it is a species of government, and like government, it is always an open question. We may theorize over abstract propositions, we may plan utopias, we may draft seemingly faultless constitutions, but we can not provide against all the evils that are wont to creep into the government of people. So, too, with systems of education. Men are similar in many respects; they are different from each other in more—and general rules for their government rarely avail. Children are but lesser men, and the difficulties are relatively as great in the management of them. Pursuing the analogy, we may learn a lesson from it. Statesmanship in the studio is of an easy accomplishment; yet nothing is so rare as a great statesman. General principles of right and wrong are easily deducible; their application to particular cases very difficult. The statesman must be practical, must be governed by circumstances, must adapt himself to events that could not have been foreseen. In educating children we should be practical, tractable and elastic. No fixed rules can govern us. The puny child may not be treated with the same freedom as the robust; the slower mind must not be driven

too hard, or the brilliant allowed to go too fast. To the good, practical judgment of every parent must be left in a great measure the particular method of culture for his children. Assuming then that education is an advantage, that a liberal education is of special advantage, and that the parent knows how to educate his children, let us consider whether there be special or any reasons why Jewish children should be peculiarly educated.

It requires ordinarily thirty years of study to form a man's mind and establish his character. Beginning in his sixth year he should study books for fifteen years and then study men for fifteen more. What is meant usually by education is the training which he receives during the first fifteen. It is very clear that natures may be warped, expanded, shriveled, perfected or corrupted by associations and extraneous influences. That goes without saying. It is equally true that the mind and heart of man is more susceptible to such extraneous influences in youth than in manhood. It follows that during youth children should be guarded with special care against such influences as may tend to deteriorate their characters. Sooner or later we must all come in contact with vice and sin, but when the impressionableness of our nature has given way to mature principles, we cope with such influences at least on equal terms. Sooner or later the Jews must rub up against the world. We must mingle with people of the world, must deal with them, fight them and with them. If we are thrown into association with them from infancy up, the result is easily foretold. We will take our complexion from such association and lose the distinctive virtues which are our boast. We still preserve that reverence for our parents which we inherit from the patriarchal times. By suffering our children to mingle indiscriminately with other children, we endanger the perpetuation of that element of our character.

The good is not so contagious as evil. Bad example is like the speck in garnered fruit; it spreads with fearful rapidity. The less discriminate we are in the associations with which we surround our children, the greater is the danger of their becoming corrupted. We should not think that mental training

alone is to be considered in educating our children. Their manners, habits, methods of thought, and, most of all, their morals, should be considered. It is necessary that they should have some associates, else they lose the stimulus of emulation, but the opposite extreme from isolation is perhaps the greater evil. I am very clear that children should be educated in groups; I am equally clear that the groups should not be constituted by the indiscriminate collection of individuals. Avowing such views, I shall doubtless be charged with being antagonistic to the free school system. I anticipate it by declaring here that I am, on the contrary, an earnest advocate of it. The two positions are entirely consistent.

The institution of free schools is clearly and properly within the police power of every government, and the revenues derived from taxation may and should be applied to the free education of any one who desires education. I may add that I am not clear that compulsory education is not also a proper exercise of the same governmental prerogatives. But because the government tenders free education, it does not follow that it must be accepted; if education be made compulsory, it does not follow that government schools must be attended. The free school system is founded upon the public policy which requires enlightenment among the people. Society at large is the beneficiary, and it is to attain that benefit to society that the system is inaugurated and maintained. This is the only argument upon which it can be sustained; it is an argument that can not be refuted. As a citizen I favor free schools, because the education they afford, imperfect as it is, is better than none, and society is benefited thereby; but as an individual I prefer to pay to support free schools and send my children to more select places. As a citizen, I regard only the good of society; as an individual, I look for the good of my own children.

If, in my judgment, there were but a shade of advantage in the private over the public schools, and I could afford the cost, I should not hesitate to avail myself of that advantage. In the nature of things all classes of children frequent the public schools. The offspring of the vilest characters are attendants,

and while the sins of the parents may not crop out in the child the chance of their reappearance is not inconsiderable, and is one we should not take if it may be avoided. It may be said that if the rich withheld their children the poor lose the benefit of good associations, and thus society is prejudiced. To this I have two answers: Society is founded upon the selfish regard of each parent for the welfare of his own young. It is nature's law that we should look after their good first and in the end society is the gainer by such selfishness. Again, it does not follow that the rich afford the best associations. Many, nay, I may say a majority, of children afford good associations even though they be of poor parentage, and poverty compels the children of many gentlemen to attend the free school.

The same reasoning that leads me to the conclusion that no man, if he can afford it, should fail to send his children to private schools, convinces me that every consistent believer in any faith should send his children to a school founded upon that faith. A man who has been educated as a consistent Roman Catholic, will, after a few years of bustling in the world, lose the prejudices that are engendered by his training and become a better member of society than one whose mind has been cultivated while his moral nature has grown up in weeds; and so in any other religion. The danger of narrow-mindedness and bigotry is very small. These are superficial faults that are worn away by a little friction with the world, and when they are worn away a solid character founded upon correct moral principles is left to withstand the many temptations of life.

In my judgment Jewish children should be educated in Jewish schools. There they should be taught the liberal sciences and arts along with a knowledge of their history and their religion. In the nature of things many are too poor to afford the expense; they should be assisted. Many live in remote communities where such schools can not exist. In such cases it becomes the duty of the parent to teach his children at home that which they can not learn at school.

It may be said that under any circumstances the parent could and should do this. I grant the claim, but alas! many are not

qualified, many will not take the time, and more have not the patience.

Let it be remembered that I am engaged in discussing how we can preserve the integrity of the Jews as such, and that I am arguing to show that not only is it a positive and direct advantage to educate our children as Jews, but it is absolutely necessary to our preservation. Experience has shown that our young people will be weaned from our people if allowed to indiscriminately associate with the Gentiles. The young have no armor to oppose bigotry and prejudice, and too often do the persecuted ones seek refuge in skepticism or apostasy from the shafts directed against them. There can be no possible disadvantage arising from exclusive schools, save the bugbear of prejudice. It is argued again and again that if we continue to be exclusive, we shall continue to be the target for prejudice.

I do not admit this conclusion, but even granting it, is it not true that if in deference to prejudice we surrender our qualities as Jews, shall we not cease to be Jews? A superficial analysis of the prejudice directed against us will show that the prejudice is either against our faults or our existence. In so far as we are faulty we are justly amenable to censure, but unreasoning prejudice goes further and antagonizes our habits, good or bad, because we who practice them are Jews. We can not satisfy such bigots. They are like the wolf with the lamb in the fable. It is our duty to ourselves, to properly educate our children as Jews, and if we are true to ourselves, we can be false to no one. Any prejudice against the right will be lived down; it can not be overcome by concessions.

The Jews have conceded everything but their religion for centuries, yet they did not advance until in France and America they were allowed to follow their own bent and did it. In France and America we act with more independence than anywhere else in the world; we have more rights and are more respected in France and America than anywhere else. The lesson is so plain that he who runs may read. The world respects the consistent and manly practice of principles, and we shall gain more favor by making ourselves good Jews than by con-

stantly seeking to hide the fact that we are Jews. I for one should be proud to point to Jewish seats of learning. I am proud to point to our charities and our synagogues, and the world esteems us because we take such good care of one another. Let us suppose that we had exclusive Jewish schools (and we have some already) and that a Gentile should censure us for their institution, what would be the basis of his objection? None but that such schools tend to perpetuate the Jews. Is it not clear that no other objection can be offered and that we can not defer to a prejudice that can not be diverted from ourselves without a severance between ourselves and our history, our traditions and our religion. No liberal man can or will censure our exclusiveness in education or marriage; no unreasonable man can be satisfied by a seeming acquiescence to the demands of his prejudice. Let us always find out what is right for us to do and do it; let us discover what is best for us to do and if right do it, and we need not trouble ourselves about the opinion of the world. The world sooner or later gets right in its opinions, but never from concessions made to prejudice. The sacrifice of principles to prejudice feeds it and it makes it grow; the independent practice of right is its deadliest foe.

Nor can it be successfully maintained, that exclusive education engenders bigotry and narrow-mindedness. If the education of the Jew were confined to the school room and the limits of the school room were narrow and confined, the result upon the mind of the pupil would probably be bigotry and narrow-mindedness, but the Jew like others, is educated more after the school room is abandoned than while he is under the direct influence of the pedagogue. Moreover, it is impossible to launch upon the world any young mind that is fresh from its books, that is free from a multitude of prejudices. The smoothness that comes from attrition with the world soon follows however the rough edges that are left by contact with mere books. The Jewish child is no exception to this rule. If, when he emerges from his exclusive school he looks upon the world with colored glasses, he will soon learn that his vision will be clearer and his conception of external objects more perfect if viewed with un-

obstructed gaze, and the prejudices that he takes with him from musty tomes will one by one be surrendered until he comes to look upon his surroundings from the standpoint of a citizen of the world. Practical experience establishes the truth of this proposition more forcibly than any amount of theories. There are schools in which the Jews are educated as Jews and from them emerge men of high talent and great energies, who achieve unbounded success in the world, and not less so than those who have their infant minds molded by contact with environments that are foreign and hostile to them. The Jewish youth who is educated in the German universities is apt to become, as experience shows, either an apostate to his religion in fact, or what is worse, a hypocrite, in that he ostensibly abjures a faith which in truth he reveres. All efforts that have been made to proselyte adult Jews, have proven abortive. The explanation of the failure is to be found in the fact that the Jewish child has been educated as a Jew. Once we permit the ever active missionary to invade the school room and practice upon the impressionable minds of our children the perpetuity of our people will end. Israel will cease to have a distinct existence among the peoples of the earth and the historian alone will be left to weep over our faded glory.

"Art and eloquence

And all the shows o' the world, are frail and vain
To weep a loss that turns their light to shade.
It is a woe 'too deep for tears' when all
Is reft at once, when some surpassing Spirit,
Whose light adorned the world around it, leaves
Those who remain behind, not sobs or groans,
The passionate tumult of a clinging hope—
But pale despair and cold tranquility."*

*Shelley's Alastor.

CHAPTER VIII.

Wherein is considered Jewish social life and its proper regulation.

Having taken the position that as Jews we should educate our children in Jewish schools so far as practicable—and should confine ourselves in marriages to our own people, it may be assumed that I favor exclusiveness to a certain extent in social life.

My reasons against mixed marriages have been sufficiently considered. My reasons for exclusive schools have also been stated. It remains for me to explain why adult Jews should be to a certain extent exclusive in their social life. I may say in the outset that my convictions grow out of considerations that apply with equal force to all classes of people, as well as to the Jews. Whether necessarily or not, it is inevitable that classes should exist in society. All men are not equal, and I believe it is safe to claim that they never will be. Some are better, purer, braver, more enlightened and more refined than others. In no country since creation's dawn have all men been on a footing of social parity. To create social equality it would be necessary to elevate the lower, or degrade the better elements. The process of elevation and degradation is constantly in progress. Those that are high, fall; those that are low, rise. In that law of social life is involved much of the advance of civilization.

I shall not stop to consider it at length as it would involve too wide and far-reaching a digression. In every man whose nature is normal there exists the ambition to rise in the social scale. Such ambition is worthy and should be stimulated. It has given to the world many of its greatest heroes. If it were possible to abolish class distinctions in society, this ambition would perish for want of nourishment. When I mention class distinctions I do not refer to classes before the law. Before the

tribunal of justice the fustian should rank with the velvet. Government should confine itself to the protection of society which creates it for that purpose, and not seek to become greater than its creator by prescribing the elements of society. There exists no valid reason why any man should be esteemed better than another, save because of his merits. If he is not possessed of such merits, it is a wrong upon society for government to give him such pre-eminence; if he be deserving public opinion will furnish the elevation without the aid of governmental interference. Aristocracy is a great good when based upon merit, and in every country independently of laws on the subject there exists such an aristocracy. Its elements are constantly changing. New members are being constantly admitted and old ones expelled. Its sphere is the world, its open sesame, gentility. To every one, irrespective of race or creed, it is open, provided the applicant be possessed of the requisite qualifications. It should be the aim of every man to join this circle.

The history of the Jews has precluded them from belonging to this class in any considerable numbers. It is needless to rehearse here what is presumed to be well-known to all of my readers. Suffice it to say that by reason of oppressive laws and bigoted persecutions, the Jews have for centuries been compelled to resort to subterfuges, hypocrisy and other doubtful practices, which all operated against their enlightenment, morality and refinement. In this great country we are relieved from the causes which have generated the evil in our habits and natures, and it behooves us to illustrate our elasticity and inherent virtue, by advancing to the high plane of gentility from which we have so long been debarred. But we can not spring from the cellar to the roof. The persecuted "dog of a Jew" whose gaberdine was but yesterday the garb of dishonor, can not in a day, by casting his old vestments aside, become a gentleman. Liberty permits and enjoins us to improve, but again I say, "reform does not mean revolution." Our progress must be gradual in order to be sure. It has already been abundantly proven in America that Jews may and do obtain a safe footing on the broad plane of gentility. The instances are limited, because our

opportunities have been of short duration. We are as a class in America in a chrysalis state. We are as different among ourselves individually as we are from the world as a people. Our general character is passing through a formative period. Sooner or later, I confidently expect that such a proportion of Jews will improve, that, despite a large element of dross among us, we shall be called a people of gentlemen. To that end we should strive with untiring devotion. In that effort we should aid each other with fraternal unselfishness. How shall we best accomplish that end?

The answer will be offered at once, that since the exemplars of gentility mostly abound among the Gentiles, we should associate with them as much as possible, in order to wear our own rudeness away. I have always been met by this suggestion, and while the answer thereto is complete, its practical operation is difficult. If gentlemen were willing to meet all Jews on a parity because they are Jews, we should doubtless derive much benefit from such association. But, while it is true that no gentleman refuses association with another because that other is a Jew, he will not, as a rule, associate with a Jew unless he be a gentleman. As we are far from being all gentlemen, we can not reasonably expect to be admitted as a class into good society. If, therefore, we desire as a class to associate in social life with Gentiles, we must seek our level or meet with humiliating repulses. Our level in social life is quite low, and those among the Gentiles who rank with us in social attributes are far below us in other respects. From such associations we should derive no good and much harm. I apprehend that no one will gainsay the two propositions I have announced, viz: 1st. That we have no right as a class to expect recognition as equals from gentle society. 2d. That from association with the lower elements we should experience more evil than good. But, unfortunately, our people are vain. We are apt to "see the mote in our neighbor's eye, and ignore the beam in our own."

We are much like the Puritans who thanked the Lord that they were not as other men. I shall find no end to the number of Jews that will agree with me when I assert that we as a class

are not gentle, but alas, I should have to search like Diogenes with a lantern for one who does not claim to be an exception. Herein lies a great difficulty. We are critical enough to detect our neighbors' shortcomings, but once we have acquired wealth, rich garments, commercial standing, etc., we imagine that we have crossed over the line that separates the lower from the better classes. Impressed with this idea many of us turn our backs upon our own people and obtrude ourselves upon others. The result is ridicule, prejudice, disgust and often rude rebuffs. Society can not be obtruded upon. It will not tolerate it, nor does it require it. It draws its members by attraction, just as the sun draws the moisture to form clouds. Whenever we possess the necessary qualifications gentle society will discover it, and extend its invitation to us. Meanwhile let us be modest. While we strive for great ends, do not let us anticipate the honors we aim for. It is the fool who wears the laurel before the fight.

But while it is true that but a small minority of our people have attained the standard required by good society, there are unquestionably some who have. The questions will be asked: Should this few continue to associate with the Jews who are confessedly beneath them, or mingle with their equals of other creeds? Is there any good reason why a Jewish gentleman should associate with a Jewish boor? To such inquiries I make this answer: The Jewish gentleman should associate with his equals, irrespective of creed or nationality, but he should not entirely deny himself to his own people. He has a double duty to perform. As a gentleman he owes his co-operation to gentle society; as a Jew he owes the benefit of his example and association to his people. He should be to them a preceptor by example. His life should be a standing encouragement to ambition, a standing rebuke to rudeness. As before stated, we are passing through a formative period. We have no distinct character at present, for the many heterogeneous elements have not had time to arrange themselves into a consistent whole. In due time we shall settle down and then there will be classes among us as among other people.

Until recently a community of suffering has kept all Jews on a level with respect to one another. Liberty permits us to emerge from that condition and regulate our relations among ourselves upon a different principle. We shall have an aristocracy among ourselves as certainly as there was one among the Jews before they became the target for universal persecution. Until that time at least we should assist each other unto the end that while our character as a people is being formed, the better elements may predominate. We should be a school unto and within ourselves. It is sad indeed to see how prone are our Jews to forget and abjure their own people. When prosperity and opportunity enable a Jew to rise superior to his people, how seldom does he concern himself about what is behind him. He is like the selfish climber who draws the ladder up when he is at the top, instead of holding it in place for the next. It will, I trust, be remarked that I do not favor non-intercourse with Gentiles. On the contrary, I strongly oppose it. When our children grow old enough to have well-settled convicitons on matters of principles, I favor a general association with their equals drawn from any source. In many instances I think the finishing touches of a liberal education should be derived at a cosmopolitan university. I believe that social intercourse between the better classes of different peoples is a benefit to both, but I am equally clear that the lower class will be prejudiced by such admixture.

It will further be observed that I do not base my conclusions upon prejudice or fear, nor upon the theory that the Jew and Gentile are like oil and water, and will not mix. I can not base it upon prejudice, for I have none. I love not the Gentile less because I love my people more. Moreover, I am frank to admit that while we have stronger and more enduring virtues than any other people, we have also deep-rooted faults which preclude us from claiming equality with the better class of Gentiles. I do not object to association because we are superior to the Gentiles, but because we are inferior to their better class. I do not oppose intercourse because of any fear, because I am convinced that any adult Jew who has been properly reared as

such is in no danger of abjuring his religion, because of such intercourse. The young or the ignorant or the hypocrites may become apostates from Judaism, or intermarry with the Gentiles, but it is a rare occurrence for an enlightened adult Jew to become an honest convert to any other religion. I do not oppose intercourse because the two peoples can not mix, for the idea is absurd. We mix with them every day of our lives. We mix with them in business, in politics and on the field of battle, why should we not mix with them in social life, other things being equal?

In leaving this subject I may be allowed to say, that in this, as in education and intermarriages, we must be governed largely by circumstances. There are communities where there can be no distinct Jewish society, there are circumstances under which the bar of exclusiveness should be raised higher than usual, or thrown down entirely. The discretion of some of our people, and their good sense, may be trusted more than others, and, in fact, a thousand exceptions may be found to the general rule.

I have already sufficiently commented upon the argument founded upon prejudice against our exclusiveness, and I shall not devote any attention to it here. If it be in the line of our advancement to be more or less exclusive, the world is the gainer, and any prejudice against it is unreasonable and should not be regarded.

The careful reader will have observed that in discussing the proper relations that should exist between the Jews and the Gentiles I have considered the parties as classes. In that aspect of the matter, as I have already shown, I favor, for the present at least, a policy of largely restricted intercourse. For fear that I shall be misunderstood, I deem it proper to discuss, in addition to what has been written, the relations of individual Jews to Gentiles as a class, and of the Jews as a class to individual Gentiles.

Nothing is so calculated to quicken the perception, mature the judgment and broaden the mind of a person as intercourse with others. Travel in strange lands has always been recognized as one of the most valuable means of education. When

such intercourse can be had without endangering the morality of the person seeking it, it should be encouraged, but when, as I have shown, it is fraught with grave danger, it should be avoided. The medicine which benefits a strong man may be death to a child. In these matters we must exercise the same judgment that governs the intelligent physician in prescribing strong medicines.

The reasons which obtain against a general intercourse with Gentiles do not and can not apply to individual Jews who are free from the shortcomings that give force to those reasons. Given a Jew who is possessed of noble instincts, who is educated, pure, refined and gentle, and there exists no reason why he should not seek the society of his equals in the great world. Such a man does not shrink from the name of Jew. He is proud of it and stands ever ready to defend it. He is not sensitive to the mention of his people, but stands ready to extol their virtues and palliate their faults. He is in no danger of becoming an apostate, for his heart clings to the traditions of his ancestors, and his mind recognizes in the simple grandeur of his creed the incomparable truth of God-worship. He will not intermarry with the Gentiles, for he is an aristocrat, proud of his lineage, and to his children he would bequeath an unmixed strain of pure Jewish blood. But he will mingle with high-minded and cultured people. He will teach them the philosophy learned from centuries of suffering; he will show them the patience that no persecution could destroy, a courage that no terrors could daunt. He will learn in his turn the blessings of the liberty his people now enjoy, he will grow strong in his permitted manhood, he will read in the liberality of a new era the palladium of his people's future and will grow more devout in his praise of Him who after so many years has at last shown us the silvery lining of the clouds. And he will not selfishly hug to himself the privileges he enjoys and the lessons he learns, but he will come back to his people and show them through himself the reward which lies within the reach of every Jew who does honor to the name. He will not scorn his people because they are not his equals. His people are to him an *Alma Mater,* to whom he

will return again and again with loving words, just as the faithful son returns to his humble mother in her lowly hut, albeit he has conquered the world. The Jew that fails to give his people the benefit of his culture, refinement and success, can only be likened to those ungrateful children who, though sprung from humble parentage, rise in the world and then ignore their parents as incumbrances.

I am thus earnest in denunciation of such baseness, because the history of our people proves how prone they are to ignore the past. In times of suffering they were ever contrite and humble to superior authority, devout in religion and tender to one another; but when prosperity dawned upon them they became haughty and impatient, indifferent to their holy religion, and rude to one another. In this they resemble those plants which flourish in dark and noisome places, but become dwarfed in the sunshine.

I can not too strongly urge upon parents the duty of impressing duly upon the minds of their children the obligations they owe to their people. They should be taught that it is neither a disgrace nor a misfortune to be born a Jew; that there is no higher patent of nobility. Our history proves us to be like the rich soil which grows in luxuriance the most noxious weeds and the choicest flowers. Remembering always the source of the growth—the fundamental virtues within us—the soil as it were of our natures, we should not flee from the weeds, but rather pluck them out, to give stronger growth to the flowers.

Let me now briefly consider the relations of the Jews to individual Gentiles:

It not infrequently occurs that Gentiles of culture and refinement, impressed with the history and inherent virtues of the Jews, desire and seek social intercourse with our people. I should be grieved if I have created the impression that to such people I would close our doors. On the contrary I would extend to them the warmest welcome. They do us a double honor in that they become our guests, and that in their conduct they recognize our virtues to overbalance our faults. Finally,

let me remark that by intercourse I mean that unrestrained commingling of spirit as well as of persons. In the nature of things, from reasons of expediency and motives of courtesy, there exists, and must continue a formal admixture, which is devoid of any flow of soul. Against this, under any circumstances, there can be no valid objection, for in it there is little if any significance.

Life would not be worth living if it were not for the many pleasures experienced in social intercourse. In the meeting of friends or congenial companions the cares of life are forgotten, the spirits are set free as the spring sunshine frees the ice in the frozen river, and all the generous and better emotions are put in exercise. Freedom from restraint, ease, the sense of home must be present, to accomplish such results. Uncongenial elements, if brought together, utterly fail to generate the happy feelings which should predominate. We seek society in order to obtain such pleasures. The associations which I have referred to are the kind which are sought in compliance with the native social demands of our being.

The better to facilitate such happiness in every country and in every age, various kinds of organizations have existed as they exist today. The Jews have theirs.

For many reasons they are exclusive. In theory they should not be so. In our social organizations we should, in deference to the argument which I have already named, admit any congenial and worthy Gentile who honors us with his application. But what may be theoretically correct may be found practically wrong. It certainly is a wrong to exclude a worthy person because he does not happen to be a Jew; but on the other hand where are you to draw the line. If we make the qualities of gentility prerequisites to admission among us, we shall exclude those who may justly charge us with being no better than they. When we shall have passed through the formative period and have progressed far enough to have a true aristocracy of our own we may carry out in practice what is undoubtedly true in theory. But while we are undergoing formation, so to speak, we must either remain unto ourselves, mix indiscriminately with

others, or the few advanced Jews must abandon their more unfortunate brethren. Of the three evils the first seems to me unquestionably the least.

In advocating this view I have had to encounter the objection that we are doing that which if done to us would give us great pain. I have been asked, what if an organization should exclude us because we are Jews? Would it be right? To such I answer this: If a number of Roman Catholics felt that because of that common tie they could enjoy social life by and through an organization composed solely of Roman Catholics we should not feel hurt at being excluded. Along with us would be excluded many others, and it would be apparent that the exclusion was not directed outward but inward. In other words we would not be excluded because we are Jews, nor the Protestant because he is a Protestant, but we would all be excluded because we are not Catholics. So again if the American Colony in Paris excluded from their social organization all but Americans, the Austrian or Italian have no reason to complain. If only Austrians were excluded there would be just ground for complaint. If from any organization only Jews were excluded, and the exclusion applied to all Jews, we would have a right to resent the affront, for it would be designed as such. It is clear, however, that when we exclude all but Jews from our organization, there is no assumption of superiority in ourselves, there is no imputation of inferiority in others. We simply declare that we can best attain the pleasures of social life by exclusion, and for that reason we prefer to remain exclusive. The gist of the whole matter lies in the intention. When Jews are denied admission to a public place because they are Jews, a stamp of inferiority is sought to be fastened upon us. But if a Jew be denied admission to a Catholic institution because he is not a Catholic nothing of ill or inferiority is imputed to him. A Protestant Christian or a Mohammedan would meet with a like rebuff.

But the question is an idle one. Gentiles do not trouble Jewish organizations with their applications, nor do they feel hurt at the knowledge that they can not be admitted as members.

The objection which is formulated in the question grows out of a morbid fear that we will do that which will excite the anti-Semitic spirit of the world. Such a fear is groundless. Wherever that spirit exists it will develop without waiting for such provocation. In America the great principles of liberty have almost destroyed that spirit, and it is only individuals who receive censure; the Jews as a class are not the objects of prejudice. The genius of this our new Jerusalem forbids such class prejudice, and it is dying out.

"Fused in her candid light,
To one strong race, all races here unite;
Tongues melt in hers, hereditary foemen
Forget their swords and slogan, kith and clan;
'Twas glory once to be a Roman;
She makes it glory, now, to be a Man."*

*Bayard Taylor's "National Ode."

CHAPTER IX.

Wherein is considered Jewish Charities.

The tendency toward generalization among modern American Israelites has in many instances been carried to a point from which even sectarian charities are denounced. It is but the logical issue of the doctrine which condemns exclusiveness in social, educational and religious matters. There is no stronger argument against the confinements which surround our social and religious life than against the limitation of our charities. From the standpoint of those who eloquently advocate the universal brotherhood of man, it must be sinful to house and feed and clothe the Jewish orphan, while the juvenile and parentless Hottentot is not sufficiently supplied with red flannel shirts and Bibles. The answer to such objections is not difficult.

It is true that charity should be universal, just as it is true that we should love all of our fellow-men. But, as already shown, if we love one another with a like degree of affection our love would be indifference, and would thus cease to be of value. It is equally true that if we could distribute our charities with impartial hands to all the needy in the world, it would fail in its object, which is the relief of suffering. Charity should be universal in the sense that everybody should be charitable, but it is absurd to contend that every charitable person should bestow his gifts universally. Charity loses its virtue when it is not effective, and it is more injurious than beneficial when not wisely bestowed.

Each individual can afford only a certain contribution for charitable purposes—so of communities and classes. Experience has demonstrated that when the contributions of a large number are combined more good is accomplished by the aggregated fund than by a like sum distributed directly by the individuals. I need not pause to explain the premises of this universally ac-

cepted conclusion. The reasons are obvious. The main reason is the power and effect of concentration as contrasted with the weakness and inefficiency of diffusion. A volume of water confined between banks scours for itself a channel to the sea; if diffused over a wide surface it becomes stagnant and evaporates. Charitable contributions should be concentrated for intelligent and effective distribution. The distribution should extend to the furthest limits within which it will always be effective. The object being effectiveness, the limits should be fixed with reference thereto.

I do not by any means advocate that Jews should absolutely confine their charities to the Jews—but I maintain that when the means of the Jews are limited they should first be appropriated to alleviating the wants of those having the highest claim. The doctrine that charity begins at home needs no champion. The heart of every humane person furnishes evidence in its support that is unanswerable. It is upon that doctrine, and no other, that I contend that since our means are not co-equal with all objects of charity, we may and should properly first devote them to caring for Jewish wants.

The wisest and purest international jurists hold that, while in the abstract every man has the right to exercise his natural prerogatives in any clime, yet it is competent for any nation to abridge those prerogatives among foreigners in order the greater to benefit its own citizens. Thus one nation may be starving for want of a market for the exchange of its own product for breadstuffs, and yet another government may be justified in protecting its own people by denying the commerce. Again, in case of pestilence, not only does one nation quarantine against another, but communities in the same nation shut themselves up against their neighbors. This is not only the law of self-defense; it is also the principle that charity begins at home. Nations and communities care first for their own sufferings, as in duty bound they should, and so with classes by whatever limits they are defined. But it is contended that there should be no classes founded on religious belief. As I have already shown, the Jews are to be classed more by reason of

the race idea than because of the Jewish religion. But conceding the fact upon which the objection is made against classes based on religious belief, is it sound? I have not discovered any reason for such a distinction save one, and of that I shall make brief mention in the next chapter. It is conceded by all that all suffering should be alleviated as far as possible, and that every man should contribute his quota to that end. It follows then that every Jew in want is entitled to aid, and that every Jew of means should be charitable, and so of every Gentile. It is too clear for argument that if Jewish contributions were indiscriminately made, and Jewish suffering left to the charity of the world at large, the suffering Jews would not receive as much aid, nor would Jewish contributions accomplish as much good as now. Under a system of sectarian charities imposition can be better guarded against than under any other system, and beyond all question a better organization can be effected for the distribution of contributions. The world at large is interested in such results as well and as much as we, for if we effectually care for our own poor we relieve the balance of the world of that charge.

But there are a multitude of other arguments in favor of sectarian charities. The contributors are brought into more direct contact with the sufferers and are moved by this and the further consideration of a common faith to more liberal contributions.

Again, in orphan asylums and homes for the widows, the aged and infirm, if sectarianism be observed, the inmates move in a congenial atmosphere; they can be educated from a common standpoint and practice their religion at a common altar. These and many other advantages are incidents to sectarianism which argue in its favor. The corresponding disadvantages are equally potent against mixed charities. But the great argument is effectiveness. Every church recognizes this and practices it, and herein lies another advantage, for different churches emulate one another in the good they accomplish, and are thus led to a more liberal support of their respective charities.

CHAPTER X.

Wherein is considered the prejudice against the Jews.

I now come to consider the only argument I have ever heard advanced by the Jews against Jewish charities: *It gives rise to prejudice!* There is something so cowardly in this that I have but little patience with it. If it were true that prejudice is aroused against us because we house and clothe our poor and educate our orphans, it would become us as men to defy a prejudice that would do us honor and shame those that display it. Shall we shrink from virtue because it is jeered at or condemned by the wicked? Alas, it is too frequently the case that men are misled from the right because evil minds ridicule and decry it. We have indeed degenerated if we can not endure what, under this government, can only be a prejudice. Our history is full of the manhood that withstood the persecution of every tyrant from the earliest ages to the present.

But, is it true that the exclusiveness I have advocated excites prejudice? Have we not always been exclusive? And were we not in the greatest degree the objects of persecution when we were compelled by law to be exclusive? Are we not respected to-day as a class by right-thinking men for virtues that are peculiar to us as a class? When Disraeli gave his "Coningsby" to the world he was not the Premier of Great Britain, and, as such, arbiter of the fate of Europe, but his genius smote a chord in the public heart that furnished answering music, unhushed to the present day. Read what he says of the Jews, and remember that it was received with favor by the reading world of this progressive century:

"You never observe a great intellectual movement in Europe in which the Jews do not greatly participate. The first Jesuits were Jews; that mysterious Russian Diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and principally carried on by Jews; that mighty revolution which is at this moment preparing in

Germany, and which will be, in fact, a second and greater reformation, and of which so little is as yet known in England, is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews, who almost monopolize the professorial chairs of Germany. Neander, the founder of Spiritual Christianity, and who is Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Berlin, is a Jew. Benary, equally famous, and in the same University, is a Jew. Wehl, the Arabic Professor of Heidelberg, is a Jew. Years ago, when I was in Palestine, I met a German student who was accumulating materials for the History of Christianity, and studying the genius of the place; a modest and learned man. It was Wehl, then unknown, since become the first Arabic scholar of the day, and the author of the life of Mohammed. But for the German professors of this race, their name is legion. I think there are more than ten at Berlin alone.

"I told you just now that I was going up town to-morrow, because I always made it a rule to interpose when affairs of State were on the carpet. Otherwise, I never interfere. I hear of peace and war in newspapers, but I am never alarmed except when I am informed that the sovereigns want treasure; then I know that monarchs are serious.

"A few years back we were applied to by Russia. Now, there has been no friendship between the Court of St. Petersburg and my family. It has Dutch connections, which have generally supplied it; and our representations in favor of the Polish Hebrews, a numerous race, but the most suffering and degraded of all tribes, have not been very agreeable to the Czar. However, circumstances drew to an approximation between the Romanoffs and the Sidonias. I resolved to go myself to St. Petersburg. I had, on my arrival, an interview with the Russian Minister of Finance, Count Cancrin. I beheld the son of a Lithuanian Jew. The loan was connected with the affairs of Spain; I resolved on repairing to Spain from Russia. I traveled without intermission. I had an audience immediately on my arrival with the Spanish Minister, Senor Mendizabel; I beheld one like myself, the son of a Nuevo Christiano, a Jew of Arragon. In consequence of what transpired at Madrid, I went straight to Paris to consult

the President of the French Council: I beheld the son of a French Jew, a hero, an imperial marshal, and very properly so, for who should be military heroes if not those who worship the Lord of Hosts?"

"And is Soult a Hebrew?"

"Yes, and others of the French marshals, and the most famous, Massena, for example; his real name was Manasseh; but to my anecdote. The consequence of our consultations was, that some Northern power should be applied to in a friendly and mediative capacity. We fixed on Prussia, and the President of the Council made an application to the Prussian Minister, who attended a few days after our conference. Count Arnim entered the cabinet and I beheld a Russian Jew. So you see, my dear Coningbsy, that the world is governed by very different personages from what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes."

"You startle and deeply interest me."

"You must study physiology, my dear child. Pure races of Caucasus may be persecuted, but they can not be depised, except by the brutal ignorance of some mongrel breed, that brandishes fagots and howls extermination, but is itself exterminated, without permission, by that irresistible law of Nature which is fatal to ours.

"Favored by Nature and by Nature's God, we produced the lyre of David; we gave you Isaiah and Ezekiel; they are our Olynthians, our Philippics. Favored by Nature we still remain; but in exact proportion as we have been favored by Nature we have been persecuted by man. After a thousand struggles, after acts of heroic courage that Rome has never equaled; deeds of divine patriotism that Athens, and Sparta, and Carthage have never excelled; we have endured fifteen hundred years of supernatural slavery, during which every device that can degrade or destroy man has been the destiny that we have sustained and baffled. The Hebrew child has entered adolescence only to learn that he was the Pariah of that ungrateful Europe that owes to him, the best part of its laws, a fine portion of its literature, all its religion. Great poets require a public; we have been con-

tent with the immortal melodies that we sung more than two thousand years ago by the waters of Babylon and wept. They record our triumphs; they solace our affliction. Great orators are the creatures of popular assemblies; we were permitted only by stealth to meet even in our temples. And as for great writers, the catalogue is not blank. What are all the school men, Apuinas himself, to Maimonides, and as for modern philosophy, all springs from Spinoza.

"But the passionate and creative genius, that is the nearest link to Divinity, and which no human tyranny can destroy, though it can divert it; that should have stirred the hearts of nations by its inspired sympathy, or governed senates by its burning eloquence, has found a medium for its expression, to which, in spite of your prejudices and your evil passions, you have been obliged to bow. The ear, the voice, the fancy teeming with combinations, the imagination fervent with picture and emotion, that came from Caucasus, and which we have preserved unpolluted, have endowed us with almost the exclusive privilege of Music; that science of harmonious sounds, which the ancients recognized as most divine, and deified in the person of their most beautiful creation. I speak not of the past; though were I to enter into the history of the lords of melody, you would find it in the annals of Hebrew genius. But at this moment even, musical Europe is ours. There is not a company of singers, not an orchestra in a single capital, that is not crowded with our children under the feigned names which they adopt to conciliate the dark aversion which your posterity will some day disclaim with shame and disgust. Almost every great composer, skilled musician, almost every voice that ravishes you with its transporting strains, springs from our tribes. The catalogue is too vast to enumerate; too illustrious to dwell for a moment on secondary names, however eminent. Enough for us that the three great creative minds to whose exquisite inventions all nations at this moment yield—Rossini, Meyerbeer, Mendelssohn, are of Hebrew race; and little do your men of fashion, your muscadins of Paris, and your dandies of London, as they thrill into raptures at the notes of a Pasta

or a Grisi—little do they suspect that they are offering their homage to 'the sweet-singers of Israel!'"

It will be observed that D'Israeli assumes and insists upon classing the Jews as a race and not as a religious community.

When the "Lasker Resolutions" and Bismarck's treatment of them were before the American Congress, Mr. Cox, the veteran member from New York, recognized Jewish merit in the following memorable words:

"This is not merely a matter of dignity or comity between nations. It is a matter of much higher concern. This manly man, Herr Lasker, was a type of a great class. He was a friend of labor. He was its interpreter and prophet, its friend and adviser in a realm where the word of the Kaiser was law, and liberty was suppressed by penalty and force. He was the representative of democracy in the largest sense of that term. He was an orator and a splendid type of the great race that has come down to us from the 'chosen people' in earlier times. The tribute paid to his memory was also a tribute to the race from which he sprung—a race whose history runs back into the dawn of time. To that race we owe our entire system of ethics and the preservation of the foundation of religion. Amid centuries of glorious nationality, and through long ages of intolerance and most cruel persecution, Hebrew virtue, pride and courage remain untarnished by the hand of time. In everything that broadens civilization, Hebrew genius, intellect, research and learning stand forth pre-eminent.

"What a race has been stricken by the death of this distinguished German and Hebrew? I say it is only a part of the history of persecutions which in this day of the nineteenth century are a humiliation and not to be tolerated in this country. In the Middle Ages one nation alone sacrificed six hundred thousand Jews. They were the flower of science, the devotees of literature, skilled in art, and enthusiastic in poetry. They were men of industry, enterprise and commerce, honest, social and hospitable. I would not suffer for a moment that we should give even a possible shadow of excuse for bowing before this terrible specter of persecution.

"Twice I have called the attention of the House—on the 21st of May, 1880, and again on the 31st of July, 1882—to the persecutions of the Jews in Russia. We have become used to the persecutions in that country. It is a part of its barbarism. But it is only within the past few years that the same ruthless system of persecution has obtained in Germany. The time of Hebraic liberty will come, and I trust soon, as it has come in this and some countries in Europe, notably in Spain, which has invited the Hebrew exiles of Germany to her shores. To the Hebrew race it is proclaimed by God Himself in Holy Writ: 'I will shake all the nations, and the desire of all the nations shall come, and I will fill this house with glory, said Jehovah the Lord of Hosts.'

"It becomes us especially, who have offered an asylum to these stricken people, and in view of their remarkable attainments in all that civilizes and blesses, that the indirect insult to their race, through one of its distinguished sons, shall receive no mitigation by tenders of semi-sympathy to the organ of autocratic power, even where that power is concealed in the silken glove of an accomplished statesman.

"If gentlemen have only noticed the signs of the times in Russia, in Austria, and especially in Germany—where the anti-Semitic movement is fomented by those very nearly connected with Prince Bismarck—they will see the animus of this attempt to humiliate us, or rather of the insult cast upon the American Congress over the dead body of Herr Lasker."

I could multiply instances without limit to show the esteem in which the Jews as such are held. We have our class defects for which we all suffer, and which each individual must live down, but we also have class virtues for which every Jew gets credit until he proves himself an exception to his class. I repeat, that in our charities we should not confine ourselves to Jews, and indeed we do not. Having alleviated the wants of those nearest and dearest to us, we should then extend our aid to others. That such is our habit is proven by countless instances. Sir Moses Montefiore devoted his life to Jewish charity, but having his hands strengthened by every civilized nation in Europe he

was enabled to extend his sphere of usefulness.* To-day the world is offering tributes of joy on his centenary and is extolling the greatest philanthropist of the age; and yet he is recognized as having kept always prominently before him as a first duty the ministration to Jewish suffering:

> "This above all,—to thine ownself be true;
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man."

*Written during the year 1885, while the great philanthropist was alive.

CHAPTER XI.

Wherein is considered the interest of society in the preservation of the Jews as such.

If it be true that society at large would be benefited by the extinction of the Jews as such, or by the decadence of their distinctive manners, customs and beliefs, the arguments which I have employed lose all their force. It will be observed that in what has previously been written I have addressed myself to the Jews as such, from a common *locus standi,* and that society at large has not been considered in the discussion. Thus far I have devoted myself to inquiring the benefits that will inure to the Jews from the preservation of their solidarity. It remains to be considered how the world will be affected if the views I hold shall prevail and be followed by the Jews. If it were possible that the Jews could be benefited by pursuing a course which would entail a disadvantage to the general public, that disadvantage would be an irresistible and unanswerable argument against the pursuit of that course. Every man and every class of men have the inalienable right to exercise and enjoy the largest liberty compatible with the good order and happiness of society, and in correlation society has the inalienable right to abridge the liberties of individuals or classes to the extent required by the good order and happiness of society. Upon these correlative rights are founded the whole structure of political and social government. Whenever either right is infringed, the equipoise is disturbed, the structure is in danger of downfall.

It is easy to formulate this rule, but none is so difficult to apply. The adjustment of these rights depends upon human minds and hearts, and the inherent fallibility of both is exhibited in their work. The application of the rule to the question under consideration is fraught with great difficulty. Theorists and visionaries may content themselves with the argument that if the

Jews be sincere in their manners, customs and beliefs, any abridgment thereof would be intolerant, and, as intolerance is wrong, the Jews have a right to exercise their manners, practice their customs and employ their belief. But this argument begs the question by assuming that intolerance is a wrong. Intolerance is not always wrong—for wrong may be what is not tolerated, and it is unquestionably a virtue to be intolerant of what is not right. Truth is intolerant of error; virtue of evil, and against such intolerance nothing can be urged, though the error or evil be practiced with never so much sincerity. It is commonly believed that our government is founded in a large degree upon the principle of universal tolerance, and this fancied element of our institutions is extolled as one of its most attractive features.

This belief is an erroneous one. I am aware that the founders of our Government, warmed by the French Revolution and heated by our own, delivered themselves of many loose expressions, even in our laws and public documents, that gave color to the idea that this is a country of universal tolerance, but a moment's reflection will demonstrate that the idea is false and unfounded. The experience of the world shows that in the struggle between the rights of individuals and the rights of society as represented by governments, the latter always prevailed, and to guard in a measure against a recurrence of that evil, the principle was ingrafted upon our Constitution, that not only should individuals be unrestrained except as required by the public good, but that in considering the propriety or expediency of restriction every doubt should be in favor of the individual. This is written everywhere between and on the lines, and this is the extent to which we have traveled toward universal tolerance. To have gone further would have exceeded the bounds of reason.

Freedom of conscience is a right which is enjoyed independent of governmental license, and which is practiced in spite of governmental inhibition. Torquemada himself, with all the machinery of the inquisition, and backed by all the power of Castile and Arragon could not prevent the weakest and poorest Jew in Spain from denying Christ *in his heart.* The utmost that

can be done by power is to prevent the promulgation of beliefs, and the practice of obnoxious forms of religion or inhibited manners and customs. This is the extent of human power, and to that extent it may be exercised whenever its exercise is demanded by consideration of the greatest good to all and the least pressure upon any of the members of society.

As a rule, the power has been employed to oppress individuals and classes, rather than to protect society. It is abused oftener than legitimately exercised, but it exists none the less. Gunpowder has perhaps done more harm than good, but its well recognized evidence as a physical and mechanical force is not thereby impaired. Such instruments are given to mankind to be used at their peril. When mountains are leveled by explosions to make highways for commerce, when sunken reefs are blasted to make safe passage for ships, we give thanks for the discovery or invention of dynamite; but when fine buildings are demolished and innocent lives destroyed by the same agency, we are apt to consider it a curse rather than a blessing. Our maledictions, however, should be directed to those who misuse the power, rather than to the power itself, and we should address ourselves to protecting ourselves against the misuse rather than against the thing which is misused. Dynamite, without evil men, would be an unmixed blessing, but evil men, even without dynamite, will always be a curse. To drop the metaphor and return to our subject proper, I would say that we should not and may not decry intolerance any more than we should bewail the invention of dynamite, for if intolerance be always directed against evil it would be an unmixed blessing. But who shall decide when the power should be exercised?

The repository of a power that is not restrained by a higher must, in the nature of things, exercise that power in its own discretion and at its own peril. Every government is in its internal affairs sovereign. Society is sovereign in its own sphere. Society must always judge what it will tolerate and what it will not endure. For an error it is responsible to posterity and to God. To limit the liberties of others is a dangerous exercise of power, and one fraught with grave responsibility, and, as society is al-

ways stronger than individuals, the exercise may be delayed without danger, and should be avoided except in cases where no doubt exists as to the propriety thereof. But when no doubt exists and the institution to be suppressed is unquestionably fraught with great danger to the well-being and safety of society, no maudlin sentiment can or should interfere.

To illustrate: suppose that a religious sect should spring up in the United States whose exercises required the sacrifice of human life (a crime that ignorant fanatics attribute to the Jews), and suppose that, in the practice of this religion in all sincerity, human beings were slain; does any one maintain that such things should be permitted in deference to a visionary idea that to prohibit it would abridge the freedom of conscience?

Society, like individuals, may and must protect itself. We have laws against polygamy which punish it as a crime, although practiced in the name of religion; and we have laws under which we can segregate and even banish lepers and other infected persons whose presence in the country is dangerous to the public. We are intolerant of personal liberty in a thousand ways, and all upon the principle that the good of the whole is better than the good of any part, and that every man is presumed to surrender to society, in return for its benefits, so much of his natural rights as the well-being and safety of society requires. Every man is master of himself and his property, but subject always to the limitation that the control of both must not interfere with the public weal. The old maxim of the law embodies the principle: *Sic tuo utere ut alienum non laedas,* "so use what is thine as not to injure what belongs to others."

To guard against misapprehension, I repeat that while the power to suppress exists and the repository of that power must judge when it shall be exercised, that repository exercises the power at his peril. It is responsible to God above all for its acts. He invests all men with the power, but none with the right to do wrong. If I be correct in my reasoning, it follows indisputably that society may frown upon Judaism and suppress Jewish institutions, manners and customs, if these institutions, man-

ners and customs do not consist with the general good, or, to be more accurate, if they endanger the general welfare.

If, therefore, any one be sincerely intolerant of the Jews, let us not regard him as perversely violating a great principle, but rather as one who is honestly misapplying it. Let us strive to show that there exists no occasion for this intolerance against us, instead of denying the right of its exercise at all. To do otherwise is to be intolerant ourselves—a fault not the least prominent, alas! that may be laid at our doors. I am firmly impressed with the conviction that there exists a strong prejudice against us; that to a large extent it is honest; that to some extent it is provoked by ourselves, but that altogether it is unwarranted. I believe that the world would be the greater loser by the extinction of the Jews, and in the succeeding pages I shall endeavor to show as briefly and as dispassionately as I can why I would regard it as a universal calamity to wipe out that great people in whose annals mixed with all their faults are to be found the highest examples of all that is noble and sublime in man.

"In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice." (Genesis xxii. 18.)

If I shall be able to show that most of the faults laid at the door of the Jews are common to all men and are not distinctly Jewish faults; if I shall further show that their distinctive faults are mainly due to enforced conditions of life and protracted persecutions; if I shall show that no other people under similar circumstances resisted temptations so well, and preserved virtues so long; if I shall further show that in the midst of temptations to evil, they not only resisted evil, but developed positive virtues and great intellectual power; and if I shall be able finally to show that the voluntary tenets and practices of the Jews are responsible for the good that is in the Jew, and not chargeable with the evil, then I take it the world is better off for the existence and preservation of the Jews as such. Let us discuss the premises in order to support the conclusion.

Character is a conglomerate. It is made up of inheritance, education, association and surrounding circumstances. An individual who is born of worthy ancestors, who is properly edu-

cated, who mingles with unexceptionable associates, and is surrounded only by ennobling influences, rises to the fullest stature of moral manhood. There may be an occasional exception; by a miracle of God the sun once stood still. But if any of the aforesaid elements of character be omitted, and in their stead be brought a factor of evil, the result depends upon the relative strength and endurance of the contending elements of good and evil.

Thus we see not infrequently the offspring of noble parents disgrace the patronymic by reason of evil associations or improper education; while on the other hand, from the lowest origin spring the grandest heroes. These seeming anomalies are but examples of a great law of human development. The most hardened criminals have been reclaimed by proper influences; the loftiest natures have been degraded by the temptation that assailed their weakest point. None may cease so far to be human as to retain no spark of the Divine. None may rise so far toward the angels as to retain no taint of the brute.

Goethe wrote somewhere, I think in his *"Wahrheit und Dichtung,"* that no man had ever had all the good eliminated from his nature. Walpole held that every man had his price. Both were right. There is something divine in man that corroding influences can not destroy, and there is something brutal in him that subjects him to temptation, which, if it fits his weakness, will cause his fall. Whatever be the native qualities of a man or a people they will have their complexion altered more or less by influences brought to bear thereon for good or evil. The character that is susceptible of the highest improvement in response to the least influence, and that is proof against degradation for the longest period and through the most numerous and trying temptations, is the most sterling. If it can be analyzed and understood, it should be emulated and preserved.

Nothing is so degrading as contumely. Self-respect is the sheet-anchor of personal honor, and the respect of others is the vital principle of self-respect. It matters not if the contempt and contumely to which one is subjected be deserved or not, if it be exhibited toward a man it causes him to shrink in sensitive-

ness from the world's gaze, it engenders his indignation and hatred, it breeds a spirit of vengeance, and finally he broods until vengeance is achieved through crime, or peace is secured in a desperate and ignoble indifference. How full is life of illustrations to this rule. Every prison is full of creatures noble once, but driven by the disgrace of the first fault to the madness of professional crime, or reckless indifference to disgrace. When from a prison career—where the surroundings are reeking with crime, corruption and temptation—a man emerges with few faults and many virtues, he has demonstrated a heroic and manly character that merits all praise.

After the battle of Hastings in 1066, the Normans took possession of England. They found in the Saxons the sturdiest and most liberty-loving and incorruptible people of Europe, and yet ere long the influence of power and wealth, persecution and bribery overcame the Saxon purity and ingrafted upon the parent tree a Norman scion that has borne most of the English fruit. History is full of examples to prove how easy it is to corrupt a people and undermine their manhood.

It records radical changes in the character and constitution of every nation, and but few in the march of two thousand years have escaped utter destruction.

"Assyria, Greece, Rome, Carthage, what are they?
* * * * * * * * *
their shores obey
The stranger, slave or savage; their decay
Has dried up realms to deserts."

The influences that have brought about the decadence of so many mighty empires are the temptations and pressures to which they have been subjected. As a rule, human conduct is governed by the fear of punishment or the hope of reward. By these means the virtues of men and of peoples have been overcome since the first fall. Miraculous almost is the escape of him who is driven to evil by fear or tempted by rewards.

The Jews since the dawn of the Christian era have been

subjected to the degrading influence of the world's contumely, that fruitful source of desperate corruption and shameless brutishness. They have, moreover, been impelled by the fear of persecution and the hope of reward to forsake their creed, to abjure their traditions, and surrender their individuality.

It has been a mighty battle that has been waged for nearly a thousand years. There has been ranged on one side the sneers and the power of the world, against a few isolated creatures with no country, no system of laws other than those of religion, no organization, no vernacular—with nothing to sustain them but only the creed that God himself taught them, and the traditions and customs that came down to them as a sacred trust from those who were admitted even into the Divine Presence. From such a struggle, not yet ended, the Jews, though victorious, have not come out unscathed.

In many instances the practice of religion has been with them the strict observance of rites and ceremonies and the utter disregard of morality, which is the essence of the religion. Driven from the ordinary walks of life, they have become moneylenders par excellence, and being forced even in this vocation to duplicity and chicanery for defensive purposes, these evils have, in a large measure, become a part of their character. Compelled to be hypocrites, hypocrisy has entered into their composition, and being denied the benefit of the laws of even natural rights, they have come to look upon Gentiles as enemies whom it is lawful to spoil. Falsehood, deceit, hypocrisy, dishonesty, ignorance, uncleanliness, boorishness, may all be laid at their door. They have become and have been false, deceitful, hypocritical, because the world forced them thereto either by degrading or oppressing them; they have become and have been dishonest because by dishonesty they lost no position, nor by integrity could they gain any.

They have been and have become ignorant at times because education was denied them in the ordinary course, and if stealthily acquired, received no recognition. They have been and remain uncleanly and boorish in some countries because they have been driven from general society and denied any of their own. What

people similarly situated could have escaped the faults that are found among the Jews? What people, under the most favorable circumstances and conditions, is free from them? Are not these faults common to all, and are they not the rule rather than the exception with the most highly favored among the nations of the globe? The municipal laws of every modern civilized people are chiefly directed to the punishment of crimes among which stand prominently perjury and theft. Deceit and falsehood are the fruitful sources from which nearly all of modern litigation springs. It requires no search to find all of these faults among the most cultured and freest peoples of the earth—and Diogenes might still hunt with his lantern for honest men. With all the appliances of modern science pestilence has not been subdued, and the filth prevailing among the people at large is the greatest promoter of these plagues. The Jews usually escape, for, despite the charge of uncleanness made against them, they are to such an extent superior in this respect to the Gentiles that the plagues seem to pass them over now as it did in Egypt centuries upon centuries ago.

There is but little that is characteristic of the Jew in the faults of the Jews. They have weaknesses like other men, they sin like other men. But the Jew is everywhere prominent as an object of comment, and the development of his shortcomings gives rise to more discussion and makes a deeper impression than that of other men. It is the tendency of the human mind to generalize. I have already shown how prone we are to adopt general rules to explain particular phenomena. The Jew being a prominent object of attention, the superficial observer (who is largely in the majority) is apt to notice particularly the failings of such as he knows, and to generalize therefrom the want of virtue among the Jews as a class. Nothing could be shallower.

If it were true that Jews are more corrupt than other men, the fact would easily be explained by their history, and thus relieve the Jewish religion, customs and traditions of the responsibility therefor. *A man is not wicked because he is a Jew, but in spite of it.* But it is not true that they are worse than other men in the same walks of life. The Jewish merchant, law-

yer, doctor, artisan or laborer is in all respects the peer of the members of the same occupations—in many respects he is *facile princeps.*

I have admitted much more as chargeable against the Jews than can be established by resort to history. I have done so because I am arguing to convince others, not to please myself, and my purpose will be best accomplished by the course I have pursued.

The intelligent student of history and of men will require no argument to explain a state of facts that he knows does not exist even though I admit it; the prejudiced and ignorant would not believe a denial that they will not verify, but they may yield to an argument that they can not refute and which destroys the force of that state of facts even though it existed.

There is nothing in the Jewish religion, customs or traditions that should breed wickedness or corruption. The traditions relate to deeds of heroism and courage, sublime resignation and charity, self-sacrifice, martyrdom and faith. The Jewish customs and practices are simple, healthful and pure; they are nearly all founded on the Mosaic laws, which modern science approves as the most wonderful code of sanitary and domestic regulation ever formulated. The Jewish religion teaches that the greatest piety is morality.

On the contrary, the traditions, customs, practices and religion of this people have bred heroes and statesmen, savants and poets, philanthropists and samaritans, to such an extent that though composing but a small fraction of the earth's population, the Jews have given to nearly every generation an immortal name, and have shaped the destiny of nearly every government under the sun since and before the birth of Jesus Christ, *the Jew.*

Let us glance briefly at the chronology of the Jews since the Christian era and note the great names that serve as landmarks in modern Jewish history.

CHAPTER XII.

Wherein is Given a Brief Resume of Jewish History since the Christian Era.

For eight hundred years after the birth of Christ the Jews were the objects of persecution at the hands of Pagans, Christians and Mohammedans. During the first century Caligula persecuted them in Rome, Jerusalem was besieged and captured by Titus, the temple was destroyed and the chosen people of God driven from the holy city. The stars that shone on Galilee looked down upon a dispersed and desolate people. The pagan legions of Rome overspread the Holy Land, and the forests of Lebanon and Zion echoed the lamentations and shrieks of a devoted race hunted to the death. Peace and security were conditions remembered only as a time long since departed. In the second century Akiba became a martyr, and the children of Israel were forbidden to even enter the city of their ancient glory. In the year 530 Justinian formulated laws against the Jews that were designed to work their extirpation, but, despite the engines of destruction brought to bear upon them, they survived and preserved their customs, manners, traditions, learning and religion. With the beginning of the ninth century opened a new era for the Jews. Haroun Al Rashid, in the Orient, and Charlemagne, in the West, fostered and encouraged the talents of the indestructible and irrepressible people. They rose to eminence in commerce and literature, and became the repositories of the wealth and the learning of the world. The Christian clergy became jealous of their power and fomented new persecutions, but it required something more than priestcraft to strike with success at a power so great as theirs. In Morocco and Spain they became the intimates of the rulers, and their merchant princes supplied the belligerent monarchs of Europe with the sinews of war. Great minds arose, and radical reforms were instituted among them. The Scriptures, by translation and commentary, were brought nearer to the common

understanding, and among other reforms polygamy, that relic of Oriental barbarism, was interdicted.

But the two hundred halcyon years were at an end when the institution of chivalry was enabled to spend its pent-up and extravagant enthusiasm in an effort to regain the "holy sepulchre." The fanaticism aroused by Peter the Hermit fell on all heretics alike. The Jews were spoiled of their wealth to equip crusaders, and their learning ceased to inspire respect among men who only respected physical strength.

In France, Germany and England the oppression of Jews was deemed a virtue in the eyes of heaven. But the endurance of the Jews was not overcome. In Spain they found a refuge, where they could at least exist.

Here arose, in the twelfth century, the great Judah Halievi, the great Aben Ezra, and the yet greater Maimonides.

Moses Maimonides, as he is usually styled, his name being in fact Rabbenu Mosheh ben Maimun Haddayan, was born at Cordova, on March 30, 1135. He lived to be nearly seventy years of age. He was, without doubt, the greatest philosopher and scholar produced by the Jews since the beginning of the Christian era. No contemporary or other philosopher during the Middle Ages, Jew or Gentile, approached him. He seems to have mastered every branch of learning, sacred and profane, and to have possesed the rare genius of giving to the world the benefit of his vast learning after distillation in his incomparable mind. As the bee sucks sweets from every flower and yields them again in concentrated and purified sweetness, so he gathered knowledge from every source and gave it forth again, improved, digested and made attractive. He acquired knowledge and dispensed wisdom on all subjects. He wrote on theology, metaphysics, mathematics, astronomy and medicine, and even poetry was not beyond his versatile genius. As pure in heart as he was strong in mind, he led an immaculate life, and declined to profit by his sacred learning. Driven from Cordova by persecution, he fled to the East, and his talents being recognized, he was raised to the highest position of personal trust. Saladin, of Egypt, made him his own physician, which office he held at the time of his death,

which occurred at Cairo in 1204. He wrote in Hebrew and in Arabic, and most of his works have come down to us. His *Mishneh Torah,* a systematic codification of the Jewish law, is yet a text-book for Jewish theolgical students, as is his commentary on *Rosh Hashanah* and the *Mishnah.* His *Moreh Nebuchim,* or Guide to the Perplexed, is rarely read at the present time, but as a work of general interest to philosophers it is still held in high esteem. It is said that Moses Mendelssohn became great through his earnest study of Maimonides' Guide. I quote from Professor Shiller Szinessy, of Cambridge, who says, in a short essay on Maimonides: "To sum up in a few words the merits of Maimonides, we may say that, with all the disadvantages of the times in which he lived, he was the greatest theologian and philosopher the Jews ever produced, and one of the greatest the world has seen to this day. As a religious and moral character, he is equaled only by a few, and surpassed by none."

Of Ibn or Aben Ezra, Dr. Mendez de Solla writes: "Abraham Ben Meir Aben Ezra was born of a noble family at the beginning of the twelfth century at Toledo. He was a man of extensive erudition and wonderful genius, perfectly familiar alike with the Aristotefian philosophy and the closest interwoven features of rabbinical literature. Taking in consideration the age in which he lived he was really eminent as a commentator, grammarian, philosopher, physician, astronomer and poet. In his fiery spirit, in the ardor of his imagination, and in his humorous vein he is unequaled by any of the Jewish literati. His style is pure, expressive and original; his sentences are elegant, sometimes lively and full of wit, but often so brief as to be obscure. Like many of his contemporaries he had a great inclination for traveling. This taste is worthy of remark as presenting a striking contrast to the life led by the monks and Roman Catholic clergy of that period. This desire of becoming personally acquainted with a world in which they met so much hostility is especially observable in Aben Ezra. The various places from which he dated his different works show in a literal sense that he was a wanderer on the earth. As a commentator on the scriptures he is

valued without exception by all. His hymn on the soul is a practical development of the idea, that every night, during sleep the soul, released from the body, ascends to heaven to give an account of the work done during the day. His poetical works extend also to nuptial hymns, elegies, satires, and even a series of verses on the game of chess. He visited also Palestine and held converse with the learned men of Tiberias upon the Masoretic text of the Bible." He died at the age of seventy.

From the beginning of the Crusades there has been but little intermission in the persecution of the Jews. In 1290, Edward I. expelled them from England; eight years later they were hunted down by Reindfleish's mob in Bavaria. In 1306 they were expelled by Philip the Fair from France, and some years later were subjected to horrible outrages in Austria and Bavaria by the Armleder mob. In 1348 there was a general massacre of Jews throughout Germany. The Black Death was raging, and to the horrors of the plague were added those of religious persecution. How sublime indeed was the courage that, amid such suffering, could be true to the faith whose keynote is the magnificent invocation: *Shemai Israel Adonai Elohenu Adonai Echod.*

It would be tedious to follow in detail the status of the Jews throughout the period of which I write. It is one long chapter of suffering and horror, throughout which shines ever resplendent the star of Jewish loyalty to the Jewish faith and traditions.

The following, taken from an article by Dr. Julius Wellhausen, of Greifswald, will convey a fair idea of their condition during the Middle Ages:

"Having according to the later medieval system, no rights in the Christian state, the Jews were tolerated only in those territories where the sovereign in the exercise of free favor accorded them protection. This protection was granted them in many quarters, but never for nothing. Numerous and various taxes, which could be raised or changed in a perfectly arbitrary way, were exacted in exchange. But in countries where the feeling of nationality attained to a vigorous development, the spirit of toleration was speedily exhaustel. The Jews were expelled by the act of

the State. England was the first kingdom in which this occurred (1290); France followed in 1395; Spain and Portugal in 1492 and 1495. In this way it came about that the Holy Roman Empire, Germany, Italy and adjoining districts became the chief abode of the Jews. In the anarchy which there prevailed they could best maintain their separate attitude, and if they were expelled from one locality they readily found refuge in some other. The emperor had indeed the right of extirpating them altogether, with the exception of a small number to be left as a memorial. But in the first place he had in various ways given up this right to the States of the Empire and moreover his pecuniary resources were so small that he could not afford to forfeit the tax, which the Jews as his *"servi camerae"* paid him for protecting their persons and property. In spite of many savage persecutions the Jews maintained their ground, especially in those parts of Germany where the political confusion was greatest. They even succeeded in maintaining a kind of autonomy by means of an arrangement, in virtue of which civil processes which they had against each other were decided by their own Rabbis in accordance with the law of the Talmud."

Spain seems to have been especially a refuge for the Jews until about the close of the fourteenth century.

Here Mr. Sen quoted at length from Sr. Mendes de Solla's erudite work on "Post Biblical History," and we omit these citations and refer the reader to that great contribution to Jewish lore.

During the reign of Dom Pedro, the Cruel, Samuel Albulafia was Minister and Santob di Carrion the poet laureate, or rather Court poet. Albulafia built, at Toledo, a magnificent synagogue in which the Jews openly worshiped God according to the dictates of their own consciences. During the reign of Alphonso V. of Portugal, a Jew (1470), Don Isaac Abravanel, was privy counsellor to the king. Abravanel was an erudite scholar, a financier, statesman and philanthropist. In 1484 his prestige and power increased by his appointment as Minister of Finance to Ferdinand and Isabella.

Perhaps no era in the history of Spain is so glorious and

famous as the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. Young, beautiful and popular, they united two fond hearts in marriage and buried in a common crown the traditional hatreds of Castile and Arragon. Under them Spain became a nation and rapidly rose to the proudest station among the great powers of the earth. The chivalry of Spain was world-famous. Her poets charmed every court in Europe, and the foundation was laid for that power which dominated Europe until the English defeated the "Invincible Armada." Under Ferdinand and Isabella, Spain achieved the end of the long and bloody wars that had been raging in Southern Spain between the Christians and Moors. The name of Isabella would be immortal had she done nothing else except devote her jewels to the explorations of Columbus. From her fair brow and arms she stripped her ornaments,

> "And took from braids of long black hair,
> The gems that gleamed like starlight there,"

to enable the adventurous Genoese to discover a new continent.*

But alas, the fanatical spirit of Rome overspread Spain like a pall of darkness. The young King and Queen, devoted heart and soul to mother Church, came under the domination of that relentless priest, Torquemada, and the Holy Inquisition began its work. The horrors of that inquest are familiar to even the superficially informed. It began in 1481, and for eleven long years the Jews of Spain endured its terrors rather than forsake the vine-clad hills and sunny valleys of their beloved Spain. But their patient and courageous suffering proved of no avail.

Mr. Prescott, in his admirable history of Ferdinand and Isabella, has given a graphic description of the status of the Jews in Spain before and at the time of the Inquisition, and in

*History now refutes this, and shows that a Jew furnished the money, as shown by Kaiserling in his work on the subject. See the Jewish Encyclopedia.

preference to any mere compilation stated in my own words I quote from his work. See 7th Chapter, Vol. I. of Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella.

*In the 17th Chapter of this splendid history is given an eloquent account of the expulsion of the Jews in 1492, of the sufferings they endured and the great loss suffered by Spain by exiling the 160,000 thrifty, cultivated and wealthy Israelites. From that time to the present the decline of Spain has been sure and steady. Frederick the Great was wise in saying that no nation profits by persecuting the Jews.

In 1492 occurred the three most notable events in the reign of Ferdinand and Isabella. The Jews were expelled from Spain, Columbus sailed for America, and Granada, the Moorish capital, surrendered to the chivalry of Leon and Castile.

In the fall of Granada Mohammedanism forever lost its foothold in Western Europe, and the Christianity of Rome has been supreme in all Spain since the day when the weak and defeated Moorish King rode over the hills in flight and paused to take his farewell glance at the towers of his famous capital. The spot is still known under the name of the "Last Sigh of the Moor"—*"el ultimo Suspiro el Moro."*. The Church of Rome had cause to rejoice over the year 1492. The hated Moslem and the despised Jew were driven from the proudest of the Christian nations.

On August 2, 1492, by royal edict, the Jews were exiled from Spain. On the day following Columbus sailed on his perilous voyage. Truly, it may be said they "builded better than they knew." Little was it dreamed on that sweltering day when the cheers of Spaniards gave god-speed to the departing mariners, that a country would be discovered by them wherein equal rights would be offered to the children of those despised Jews who were sadly leaving the sunny slopes of Spain.

"There is a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough hew them as we will."

Singularly enough, among those whom Columbus took with him on his perilous voyage was one Louis de Torres, an Israelite

who had ostensibly embraced Christianity under the persuasive influence of the Inquisition. Columbus took him because of his great familiarity with oriental languages, which it was supposed would come into requisition by the discovery of the Eastern shores of Asia. Torres must have enjoyed the confidence of his commander, for when Columbus, mistaking Cuba for Asia, desired to send messages to the great Khan, he entrusted this dangerous and delicate mission to Torres and one Jerez. It was on this journey that tobacco was first discovered by any European (see Irving's Life of Columbus, Chapters 3 and 4).

The great wealth and learning of the Jews always insured them a welcome in one country when expelled from another. When driven from Spain they fled to Holland, Portugal and Germany, and when driven from these countries they fled to others, great numbers flocking to Turkey, where they rose to great prosperity.

The Reformation distracted the attention of the Christians from the Jews. The Church had its hands full with Luther and Calvin, and the Reformers were driven to sore straits themselves. The Reformed Christians and the Jews were like the tiger and the deer when driven to an island by a flood. A common misfortune insured peace. Thus we find Luther early in the Reformation defending the Jews; two score years later, when he felt his ground to be safer, he turned upon them in fierce assault. The flood had subsided, and the deer was lawful prey.

The sixteenth century added many names to the Jewish pantheon. In all of Europe the Jews flourished with varying, but rather brighter fortunes. During this time flourished Loans, Eliah Levita, Caro, Rossi, Medigo, Modena, Mordecai, Meisel, Gans, the astronomer, Rabbi Loew and many others. The seventeenth century was one of constantly varying fortunes. The Jews were expelled from Frankfort in 1614; practically so from Poland in 1628; from Vienna in 1670. But they were admitted to Germany from Poland in 1628; they settled in Brazil in 1642 and in New York and New England in 1654. In 1655 Manasseh ben Israel, the author of a "Defense of the Jews," pleaded with

Cromwell for the admission of his people into Merry England, and eleven years later the Israelites were allowed to return.

The Spanish and Portuguese refugees of the previous century in large numbers fled to Amsterdam, where soon arose a powerful, wealthy and learned colony of Jews. They enjoyed much respect from the honest burghers of the Dutch capital, and furnished many famous names to the history of Holland. Notable among these are DePinto, Suasso and Mélo, the philanthropists; Saul Morteira, the great rabbi, and Uriel Acosta and Baruch Spinoza, the skeptics. To Berthold Auerbach, another Jew, we are indebted for a magnificent picture of the times and the progress of Jewish thought (*vide* his "Spinoza"). Acosta's career was a tragedy. His independence of thought led him to reject the dogmas of Rome under which he was reared. His father became a convert to Christianity under the influence of Portuguese persecution, but the young Uriel returned to Judaism and passed over to Amsterdam to enjoy the liberty of his conscience. Here he made assaults on the corruptions in the Jewish worship. Twice was he excommunicated, and twice restored to the Jewish fold. His personal sufferings were permitted to color his views on religion, and the opposition to his assault on mere forms of the religion drove him to disbelieve the essence thereof. He lacked consistency and enduring courage, and, according to Jewish legends, after recanting, he died by his own hand. He left several able theological works.

Spinoza possessed a great mind and a great heart. His personality was merged in his philosophy. His own sufferings and privations were as naught to him. Always cherishing a warm love for his people, he gradually drew away from orthodox Jewish ideas. He was made a rabbi while very young, and was deemed a prodigy of learning and controversial talent. His pantheistic philosophy is well known. His luminous mind and wonderful reasoning powers have gained for him the title of "father of modern philosophy."

During the eighteenth century the Jews made vast progress toward emancipation. In 1723 they were admitted to citizenship in England. In America they became more numerous, and in

1728 opened the first American synagogue in New York. Less than five generations have pased since then, and now every town of any pretensions in the United States boasts a Jewish synagogue.

The first silk manufactory of Prussia was established by Jews in 1730. In 1748 the great Montesquieu, recognizing the merits of the Hebrews, pleaded for their emancipation, and invoked a spirit of tolerance for the devoted and long-suffering people. At the same time Lessing and Gellert, in Germany, discarded and repudiated the fashionable prejudice against Jews, and wrote in their behalf. Among his works nothing reflects so much glory upon the name of Lessing as *"Die Juden"* and *"Nathan Der Weise."*

His efforts in behalf of the Jews are directly due to the influence of the great Hebrew luminary of the century, Moses Mendelssohn, who was Lessing's great friend, and the prototype of Nathan the Wise.

Moses Mendelssohn was born on September 6, 1729, at Dessau. His father was a "transcriber of the law," that is to say a professional copyist of Hebrew manuscripts. At the early age of three years Moses was taught the wise sayings of the Talmud. He was educated by the pious and learned Rabbi Frankel, with whom he subsequently went to Berlin. His pure life and great talents soon brought him into notice. He became the intimate of Lessing and Gellert, and one of the leaders of German philosophical thought. In a competition he took the prize even over the great Kant, who was one of his rivals. His successful contribution is still famous and much studied. (*Ueber Evidenz in Metaphysichen Wissenschaften.*) It would be tedious to enumerate his works and influence. Through him a spirit of tolerance toward the Jews was generated in Germany, which received much strength from the liberal authors who preceded the French Revolution. It is said of Mendelssohn that "every visitor to Berlin, Jew or Gentile, sought to make his acquaintance at a kind of *Salon* which he held in the afternoons." Yet Frederick the Great refused him election to the Berlin Academy. This tyrant is said to have remarked that "no government ever prospered by oppress-

ing the Jews," but he yielded, nevertheless, to prejudice, and excluded from the Academy the author of "Phædo." The grandson of Moses Mendelssohn, Felix, is known as one of the greatest musical authors of the world.

With Mendelssohn begins properly the end of mediæval and the opening of the modern history of the Jews. I have not undertaken even to give an outline of the Jews of the Middle Ages, because neither the limits nor design of this article will permit of any historical excursions. Much more am I precluded from undertaking any extended notice of modern Jewish development. Great names crowd, one so fast after the other, that I cannot pause even to mention them. A few of them (and only a few will I set down here) will serve to show how wonderful indeed has been the achievement of the Jews despite the degrading influence of persecutions during the dark ages. Of the effect thereof I make the following quotation from an article by Israel Davis: "The persecutions of the Middle Ages had produced their natural effect. Cut off from their fellow-citizens, excluded by oppressive laws from all trades except that of peddling in old clothes, and even from buying certain classes of these; specially taxed, confined to Ghettos and Judengassen, strictly prohibited from entering some towns, limited in numbers in others; forbidden to marry except under restrictions designed to check the growth of the Jewish population; disabled from enjoying Christian servants, or being members of trade guilds, the Jews *seemed by their abject condition to deserve the evils which were its cause.*"

Reflect for a moment on such a condition as is above portrayed being the fate of a people for centuries, and then ask yourselves what must be the native virtues of that people if they emerge with honor and furnish more heroes in proportion to numbers than any other people, oppressed or free. Consider that Wessely, Lowe, Marcus Herz, Heine, Borne, Gans the jurist, Rahel, Neander the historian, Jonas and Zacharias Frankel, Hildesheimer, Jost, Zunz, Rapaport, Geiger, Graetz, Furst, Steinschneider, Herxheimer, Herzfeld, Phillippson, Lehman, are the names of Jews. Berthold Auerbach, whose hand was upon the heartstrings of the German people, was a Jew; Heinrich Heine, that remark-

able character in philosophy and resplendent light in poetry, was a Jew; Edward Lasker, the peer of Bismarck in politics, and his superior in all other respects, was a Jew; Rubenstein and Joachim in music, Traube in medicine, Lazarus in psychology, Benfey and Bernays and Wehl in philology, are the names of Jews. What a magnificent galaxy they all make, and yet they are all taken from Germany only and within an hundred years!

Notwithstanding the multitude of great names added to German history by her Jewish subjects, the Jews have been consistently and persistently persecuted by the German people and government. It was not until 1803 that the infamous Leibzoll was finally abolished in Germany. This was a tax imposed specially on Jews whenever they crossed the boundaries of a city or petty State. In 1812 they were recognized as citizens, but after the war of liberation, in which they distinguished themselves, they were subjected to new restrictions, or a revival of those that had fallen into desuetude. During the Liberal movement, in 1848, their liberties were enlarged, but it was not until the establishment of the German Empire (1871) that civil and political equality was accorded to the Jews. Even this did not stifle the spirit of intolerance. A few years later Stœcker, the preacher of the Emperor, became the head of what is called the "Anti-Semitic" movement. Leagues had been formed throughout the Empire to ostracize the Jews and otherwise persecute them. That the movement was not distasteful to the Iron Chancellor (Bismarck), goes without saying. The court preacher would not have dared to have identified himself with the movement save with the sanction of the ruling genius of Germany. It was only in deference to the outraged public opinion abroad that the Government finally interfered to prevent such outrages as resulted in the destruction of the synagogue at New Stettin.

The avowed grievance on the anti-Semitic leagues is the prominence of the Jews in science, literature, art and commerce. It is alleged against them that they monopolize the commerce of Germany and control her finances. What an argument for persecution! What an apology for crime! What a commentary on German civilization! The Jews of the German Empire constitute

only one per cent of the population; they have just emerged from centuries of degradation and persecution; only emancipated in 1871 and yet the most powerful nation on the continent, and one that boasts the highest order of thought, education and development, encourages leagues to combat them! Ninety-nine men uniting against one!

When Napoleon plowed the fields of Germany with the hoofs of his war horses and made them fertile with German blood and bones, the Jews were favored by the panic-stricken Teutons. Their talents, their treasure and their valor were needed and all were given with alacrity. When the invaders were driven back the Jews were placed under a cloud again—and today when Germany dominates Europe, the Government smiles at assaults on the people that gave Lasker to lead the fight for constitutional liberty. Wonderful indeed is the people that in a nation of fifty odd millions can and does furnish the leaders in science, politics, literature, art and commerce out of a pitiful one per centum of the whole population.

Let us now glance for a moment at the progress of the Jews in France. It is to be observed that the Jews are a patriotic people. Under whatever government they exist, they are as a rule loyal to the "powers that be," and wherever they have been accorded liberty their devotion has known no bounds. The favorite countries of the Jews are France and the United States.

In 1790 Mirabeau and St. Etienne championed the claims of the Jews for equal rights in France, and in 1791 they were admitted to full citizenship by act of Assembly, which was confirmed in the Constitution of 1795. The Jews testified their grateful appreciation of the privileges thus extended, by pouring out their blood and contributing their wealth in the fearful conflicts in which France became engaged.

In 1807 the great Napoleon convoked the celebrated Sanhedrin to formulate a code of laws for his Jewish subjects. It was a great event for the Jews, and yet greater for France. I shall not pause to analyze the work of the Sanhedrin. It is matter of history. The liberties accorded by Napoleon to the Jews, and which have been continued to this day, completely eliminated the Jewish

question from French politics. The Jews became prime factors of French civilization, but no longer vexed the statecraft of the government. France does not offer as many prominent Jewish names as Germany. Separate development has not been stimulated in France by political restrictions as it has been in Germany. The general character of the French Jews is higher, however, than that of German Jews. They are freer from the hereditary faults, and more pronounced and consistent in the display of hereditary virtues. They are more pious, yet freer from cant; they are more cultured, yet less disposed to the skepticism so common among enlightened Germans.

Among the great French Jews of the country I will only mention Adolph Cremieux, the statesmen Fould and Goudchaux, the savants, Jules Oppert and Halevy, Meyerbeer, the composer, the philanthropist Baron Hirsch, and the distinguished members of the French branch of the Rothschild family.

As already stated, the Jews were readmitted to England in the time of Cromwell. In 1658 they were first permitted to bury a Jewish corpse in a licensed Jewish cemetery. As late as 1845 it was doubted if even English-born Jews could legally hold lands in England. In 1754 popular clamor succeeded in effecting the repeal of Mr. Pelham's Jewish naturalization act, which had passed the year previous. The statute *de Judaism,* which prescribed a particular garb for the Jews, was only repealed in 1846, but it was then a dead letter, and had been for two centuries. By the reform act of 1832, the right of suffrage was extended to the Jews. The progress toward full recognition, it will be observed, was exceedingly slow. Macaulay and Lord Russell, great as was their influence, fought for long years in vain to fully emancipate the Jews. Baron Lionel de Rothschild was five times returned to Parliament by the city of London, and was eleven years a member before he was allowed to take an oath omitting the words "on the true faith of a Christian." In 1858 this insuperable obstacle was removed. Seven years before Salomons took his seat, having omitted the words. He was, however, fined and obliged to retire by decree of the Exchequer Court. Until 1828 the number of Jewish brokers in London was limited to twelve. Sir D. Salomons,

the first Jewish Sheriff of London, could not qualify until by a special act passed by Lord Campbell, an oath was prescribed which he could take. Two years later (1837) Sir Moses Montefiore was elected. The latter was an alderman for ten years before he could qualify, Lord Syndhurst's act (1845) enabling him to do so.

English history boasts many great Jewish names. In theology we have in the latter part of the seventeenth century Jacob Abendano and David Meto; in mathematics, Sylvester, Sarmento and Gompertz, both of the latter being fellows of the Royal Society. Among linguists there are Goldstucker, Zedner and Deutsch; among barristers, Goldsmid and Judah P. Benjamin, who, however, more properly belongs to the United States. In literature, da Costa, who in 1769—the date of his death—was Secretary and librarian of the Royal Society; Isaac Disraeli, Benj. Disraeli, David Ricardo, Lopez and many others. In politics, Beaconsfield, Salomons, Montefiore and Rothschild and a long list of others who are philanthropists as well. In all other countries of the globe we find great men who are Jews, in all departments of life. In the United States they fill positions of prominence and trust in all the spheres of private and public life. Among our leading statesmen, orators, lawyers, physicians, theologians, artists, musicians, actors, capitalists, financiers and merchants is to be found the irrepressible Jew.

On the 16th of January, 1825, there was founded in Charleston, S. C., the Reformed Society of Israelites. Through the kindness of my friend, Mr. Abraham C. Labatt, one of the original signers of the Constitution of that Society, I have been permitted to read the Constitution of the Society and the ritual adopted by it. The originators were men of marked intelligence, courage and purity of purpose, as is evident from their work. They breasted the storms of indignation that grew out of their innovations, and bravely continued the work which was perhaps the foundation of the American reform movement. I must leave to some historian of the Jewish Church the work of analyzing the history and progress of the Society. I merely mention it to show that in a free country enlightened Jews, relieved from the pressure of persecution, directed their energies to reform. This move-

ment, however, had no radical tendencies. It did not address itself to doctrines, but merely to ceremonies. It was at a later date and by a different class of men, that innovations were made upon the body as well as the habiliments of Judaism.

The reform movement, whether well or ill-advised as a policy, unquestionably grew out of the purest motives. The Jew has in every age been distinguished for untiring and restless energy. Amidst persecution he had no time for reform. All his strength and resources were husbanded to meet and ward off hostile assaults from without. In America, however, he was almost entirely free from persecution, and the innate powers of the Jew were directed to self-improvement. As a monarch at the end of foreign wars directs his attention to internal improvement and reform, so the Jews in America, for the first time in centuries at peace, turned their eyes inward. Unfortunately what was conceived in such a laudable spirit, has been carried to most unwarranted limits. It would be surprising indeed if they did not go to extremes. Sudden freedom is always characterized by excesses, but the conservatism and natural balance of the Jewish mind is asserting itself, and ere long there will be evolved a symmetrical, logical and attractive ritual and system of worship. Recent developments in the United States give unmistakable color to this prediction. The people have asserted themselves and the leaders have heard from them in unmistakable terms. When at Pittsburg in 1885 the Rabbis issued the celebrated Delphic oracle entitled the "Postulates of Reason"—and at the same time paved the way for the abolition of the holy Jewish Sabbath and the covenant of Abraham, a storm arose which demonstrated a fact which had been overlooked. Beneath the apparent indifference of the American Jews there slumbered a great and indestructible love for the ancient creed. The new generation clung to it not only for its great truths and beauties, but also because of its great antiquity; and the elders under the influence of their children's enthusiasm, felt the old earnestness quicken in their hearts. They reminded themselves or were reminded that it is not good "to cast stones in the well from which they had drunk," and they hastened with renewed devotion to the long-neglected shrines. A new impetus

has been given to Judaism in America by the collapse of radicalism in 1886, and it would require a prophet to foresee the greatness of the Jews in the land of liberty. It may aid the reader in speculating upon that future to be informed of a few of the achievements of the Jews in the United States up to the present time. They have not been few or unimportant, for the heat of radicalism and the cold of indifference in religious matters have been alike impotent to affect the innate charity of the Jews. Throughout all ages and all manner of calamity they have illustrated by their lives the sweet gospel of Moses: "Love thy neighbor as thyself." (19 Leviticus, 34.)

I have been unable to find any comprehensive statistics concerning the American Jews, but from the meagre data available I have been able to collate a number of interesting facts, which if they be not strictly accurate, may be safely received as within, rather than beyond the truth.

There are four great charitable fraternities in the United States, viz.: the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith, with an aggregate of nearly 25,000 members; the Free Sons of Israel, with nearly 12,000 members; the Improved Free Sons of Israel, with about 3,300 members, and the Kesher Shel Barzel (Iron Link), with over 9,000 members. All of these great organizations are founded and conducted upon philanthropic principles. From official reports I find the B'nai B'rith (Sons of the Covenant), aside from and exclusive of endowment and sick benefits, bestows annually almost $150,000.00 or $6.00 per capita in charity. The average in District No. 7, composed of Tennessee, Florida, Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisana and Texas, is over $9.00 per capita, and exceeds by far the average in any other district. The aggregate membership of the other three orders named is about 25,000, and if we credit them with an average per capita charity of $4.00 per annum, we have a quarter of a million dollars contributed by the fraternities alone. But notwithstanding the vast extent and usefulness of these orders, we find in nearly every important town where the Jews reside, a Hebrew benevolent society whose sphere is local. Certainly not less than $250,000.00 is annually distributed by these organizations.

The Jews in the United States own, support and successfully operate a number of great charity hospitals, among which are Mt. Sinai Hospital in New York, Jewish Hospital in Philadelphia, Hebrew Hospital in Baltimore, Jewish Hospital in Cincinnati and our own Touro Infirmary at New Orleans.

In addition to these they own, support and successfully operate a large number of charitable asylums, such as the Hebrew Benevolent and Orphan Asylum in New York, Foster Home and Orphan Asylum in Philadelphia, B'nai B'rith Orphan Asylum in Cleveland, Jewish Orphan Asylum in Baltimore, Pacific Orphan Asylum in San Francisco, Home for Aged and Infirm at Philadelphia, Home for Aged and Infirm Hebrews in New York, Familien Wiasen Verein in Philadelphia, Deborah Nursery and Protectory in New York, Sheltering Guardian Society in New York, and the Jewish Widows' and Orphans' Home in New Orleans. I have possibly omitted some of the Jewish eleemosynary institutions which are entitled to rank along with those I have mentioned.

Besides the above there are great numbers of relief, free burial, free fuel and free school societies in the larger cities.

The annual cost of the conduct of these various institutions I have deemed it safe to place at not less than $500,000.00.

The private and miscellaneous, but strictly Jewish charities I have, after careful consideration, placed at an average of $1.00 per capita or $300,000.00. We have then a grand total of $1,800,000.00 expended annually by say 300,000 Jews in strictly Jewish charities, an average per capita of $4.33 1-3. Estimating that there is an adult male to every six persons, we will find that there are but 50,000 male adult Jews in the United States and as the burden falls almost exclusively upon them, their capita averages $26.00 per annum. But it is well known that the Jews are charitable to others than those of their own faith. I venture to estimate their general charities at one-half of their sectarian charities. That would swell the grand total to nearly $2,000,000.00 per annum, or an average per capita for each male adult of $40.00.

If the same generosity were displayed by the people at large the charities of the whole country would reach the enormous

amount of four hundred millions per annum, a sum larger than the national revenues and almost equal to the value of two cotton crops.

It must be remembered that in my estimates I have not included the sums paid out for sick or endowment benefits. These I consider beyond the pale of strict charity, although in many respects they may be considered as falling within it. I have also excluded congregational expenses. There are about three hundred congregations in the United States, being one for every 1,000 Jews, and the annual expenditure is not less than $1,000,000.00, or an average of $20.00 per capita for each male adult.

The great fraternities pay out annually to Jewish widows and orphans in the shape of endowments, more than $500,000. In the larger towns and cities there are Young Men's Hebrew Associations, Dramatic and Literary Societies, schools of various kinds and in fine every species of organization designed to encourage science, literature and art.

But while the Jew is sectarian in his charities and his pleasures he is not so as a citizen. They belong to all political parties and there is no such thing as the Jewish vote.

In this country, moreover, the Jews have ceased to be mere money makers. They are invading every walk of life. In law, medicine, journalism, art, literature, engineering; in music and the drama, they are to be found in great numbers and generally in the front rank. When we contemplate the wonderful attainments of the Jews in this country we are impelled to exclaim with Balaam: "How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob; thy tabernacles, O Israel! As the valleys are they spread forth, as gardens by the river side, as the trees of lign-aloes, which the Lord hath planted, and as the cedar trees beside the waters." (24 Numbers, 5 and 6.)

CHAPTER XIII.

Wherein is Considered the Cause of Jewish Greatness and Its Destiny.

I have only endeavored to give the briefest outline of Jewish progress from the beginning of the Christian era to the present time. To have undertaken more would have enlarged the limits of this work far beyond its original design, and would have led me into a field that I have neither the ambition, the time nor the ability to explore. My purpose has been solely to state in meager outline the prominent events of Jewish history in order that therefrom I might obtain, and present the factors of a problem, that it is proper for me to consider in this essay.

It will have struck the reader as remarkable if not amazing that there should still exist a people who for so many centuries have been oppressed, persecuted and condemned—and yet more marvelous must appear the fact that this people, the Jews, is great in numbers, spread over the whole face of the globe, enlightened and civilized to a high degree, physically, morally, and intellectually unsurpassed, excelling as financiers, artists, statesmen, musicians and philosophers;—wonderfully free of criminals and prolific of moral exemplars and seemingly but launched upon a career of unrivalled greatness. What is the mystery of this indestructibility? Why do the Jews continue to exist under conditions that have destroyed all other peoples?

A casual reading of history will discover that whenever two heterogeneous peoples have come in contact the one absorbed the other, or by amalgamation the two formed a new stock. And further, that when assimilation did occur the weaker people inevitably passed away.

The aboriginal American, for example, savage though he

was, presented the noblest form of man in his native state. Brought in contact with a superior people, he refused to assimilate, and in a few centuries the Indians have dwindled to a mere handful of drunken, treacherous wretches. The gypsies are rapidly disappearing from the face of the earth, and it is so of every race that preserves the purity of its blood and the practice of its customs while subjected to the pressure of a superior power or powers. In all history the Jews stand alone. They are *sui generis*. To them no general rule in the philosophy of history can be applied. For two thousand years they have been scattered, hunted down, murdered, pillaged, tortured and despised; during all that time they have been stanchly loyal to their *Penates* and their religion, and to-day they are stronger, wealthier, freer, more enlightened and more powerful than ever. What is the explanation?

In discussing the origin of Jewish greatness I have already shown that the Jews can not be judged as other people—and again must we seek for new methods in solving the problem of Jewish indestructibility. The religious fanatic will satisfy himself with the simple explanation that it was prophesied of old by those divinely inspired, and that they are the special care of Providence. Disraeli attributes it to the fact that they are an unmixed race of Caucasus.* Spinoza explains it by the stubborn adherence of the Jews to the rite of circumcision, and numerous other writers have advanced as many different theories.†

But something more than a prophecy; something in addition to unmixed blood, and certainly something higher than a

*In "Coningsby" occurs the following: "You can not destroy a pure race of the Caucasian organization. It is a physiological fact; a simple law of Nature, which has baffled Egyptian and Assyrian Kings, Roman Emperors and Christian Inquisitors. No penal laws, no physical tortures can effect that a superior race should be absorbed in an inferior, or be destroyed by it. The mixed persecuting race disappears; the pure persecuted race remains. And at this moment, in spite of centuries, tens of centuries of degradation, the Jewish mind exercises a vast influence on the affairs of Europe. I speak not of their laws, which you still obey; of their literature, with which your minds are saturated, but of the living Hebrew intellect."

†Renau and Wellhausen maintain with much force that the Jews are no longer an unmixed race.

mere rite, must be found to explain such phenomena as are found in the lastingness of the Jews.

Not any one of the peculiarities to be found among the Jews, but all or nearly all of them are responsible for it. Not the rite of circumcision, not their unmixed blood, not their exclusiveness, not their religion, not their sanitary and dietary laws, not their close and familiar communion with their God, not any one of these, but all of them combined have produced virtues physical, intellectual and moral, that nothing inimical could withstand, and which have withstood assaults of every character and of the longest duration. The elements that make up a national or race character are as manifold as those which enter into the constitution of individual characters—and there is as little likelihood of finding perfection in the one as in the other. All *a priori* reasoning must fail in practical sociology, for the factors of the problems are always doubtful and frequently as uncertain as the solution which we seek to obtain. We must obtain theories by inductive reasoning based upon wide experience and practical observation. Plato and others constructed perfect governmental machinery upon paper, but no Utopian constitution could stand the strain of practical operation. The founders of the American Government, rich in the wisdom of experience, framed the most perfect government ever known, and yet in less than a century millions of lives and treasure were spent to explain its meaning.

The philosopher and the theologian will map out a perfect theory of education and moral discipline, and the military commander will formulate a perfect system of tactics; but be the theories never so plausible, experience has shown, as it always will show, that mere theories will not serve to educate the mind, the conscience or the body. Moreover there are operating influences that are recognized but not understood or explained. The Almighty permits us to see His works, but withholds them from our understanding. Thus in medicine we find that physicians use certain drugs to produce certain effects, and that the effects are produced, but how or why they can not explain.

"Knowledge comes but wisdom lingers * * * "

It is perhaps not possible to perfectly explain the history of the Jews and why they have outlived the influences that have destroyed all other peoples similarly situated. But we do know that they have survived events that have been all powerful against others and powerless against them; we do know that they have remained strong under circumstances that made others weak; intelligent when others grew ignorant; wealthy when others grew poor; brave when others grew cowardly; refined when others became savage, and lastly, moral when others became debased and criminal.

We know further that this people are distinguished by certain peculiarities; that they have their own religion, from which all others sprung, and which is none the less vigorous because so often in parturition; that they have a peculiar systems of laws semi-religious and altogether sanitary; that they have traditions and customs to which they cling with unequaled tenacity; that they are exclusive in social life; that they are jealous of the purity of their strain; that their homes are governed by the old patriarchal principle; that filial and fraternal duties are practiced as of course; that they are singularly free from crime; that their vital statistics are better than any other people; that they are brave, enterprising, quick-witted and reliable, and above all that they worship one God, not so much according to a particular form, but in accordance with their religion, which teaches that morality is religion.

We may not be able to discover the nexus between the peculiarities of this people and their indestructibility, but it is only fair to connect the two and attribute the latter to the former. And further, it is but fair to argue that if such peculiarities have enabled this people to withstand a powerful pressure toward evil and have propelled them toward the good; if they have produced a people so strong, so brave, so powerful, healthy, enterprising, intelligent and law-abiding, then the world at large would be the loser if any of these peculiarities were abandoned —for to all of them we may fairly infer is due the character of this people, and the character and works of this people are of value to the world.

I shall not pause to argue so plain a proposition as this latter. If the distinguishing characteristics of Jewish social and religiou life are responsible for the virtues of the Jews and not for their faults, the proposition is self-evident. But it will be as it has been maintained, that the virtues of the Jews are theirs as men, and not as Jews; that the same individuals, if Christians, would have developed the same qualities of head and heart. This is possibly true. Certainly the contrary can not be demonstrated, but it can be established as highly probable. If two sets of individuals live in the same climate, enjoy like surroundings and are subject to the same laws, and one set follows one hygienic system and the other set another, we naturally judge the merits of the respective systems by the results. Yet this is far short of demonstration, for perhaps, without any system, the one set may have remained healthy as a class and the other grown sickly. The Jews have not enjoyed equal advantages under the law or in the schools, and yet they have, as a class, outstripped their neighbors. This fact is phenomenal and may not be explained by the theory of chance. If chance operates consistently for two thousand years, it rises to the dignity of a law. There is but one explanation, and that is the spiritual, domestic and physical life of the Jews.

The practice of their religion, the observance of their traditional customs, their oriental devotion to their parents, their exclusiveness, their pure and comparatively unmixed blood, are the basis of their greatness. Who would endanger the structure by undermining the foundation must crave the infamy of that wild youth who fired the temple of Ephesus that his name might be ever remembered. I have frequently insisted that the Jews have less to fear from the bigotry of others than they have from their own indifference. The world has come to recognize them as indestructible. Their destiny lies with themselves. The opportunity afforded them by the civilization and liberality of the nineteenth century surpasses all those enjoyed since they had a kingdom and a king. In most of the enlightened nations of the world, and notably in England, France and the United States, they have found a new Jerusalem. The future is theirs

to be great or pass away from the earth forever. What will they do with it? Will it come to pass when the traveler from New Zealand stands on London bridge and muses over the ruins of St. Paul's that he will also seek in dusty tombs for the history of the last of the Jews, or will he marvel then as we marvel now, that this one people of all others, and the only one, should survive pyramids and temples, coliseums and catacombs, despotism and constitutions—and remain ever vigorous and young, as indestructible as the ocean by which they are so fitly symbolized?

THE SUCCESSFUL LIFE.

A Commencement Address Delivered Before the Graduating Class of the University of Texas, June 14, 1899.

In the physical sciences the outposts of one generation are points of departure for the next. Not so in the philosophy which deals with man's morals and happiness. There is scarcely a proper rule of human conduct which is not to be found in ancient writings, sacred or profane. The restatement of them in later days has consisted simply of giving new words to old ideas.

The precepts of wisdom so early pronounced in the history of man have since been accessible to him as an inexhaustible storehouse of wealth. Their intrinsic merit has been invested with the charm of epigrammatic expression, and in proverbs the highest truths have been given universal currency. Unfortunately the treasures thus ready to our hands are not generally enjoyed. The great majority of men fail to profit from either precept or experience. Of the rest, by far the greater number learn only from what befalls themselves and die before their education is half completed. The remaining few grasp the lessons taught by others, and to these we attribute the gift of genius.

The commonplace, more than the extraordinary mind, requires counsel, but seeks it less eagerly and is benefited less thereby. So the weak plant requires more nourishment than the strong, but is slower to send out roots in quest of or to utilize it when found.

Lessons of truth are like the countless seeds which plants yield in their efforts at reproduction. An insignificant number germinate, and of these how few escape destruction before the bud develops into blossom, the blossom into fruit and the fruit into seed again. It is only under favorable conditions that the

germ, however perfect in itself, will sprout and grow. If the soil be barren, the climate hostile or the planting unseasonable, there will be "none, or bitter fruit." The plainest truths ever uttered even by inspired lips will not find lodgment and growth in minds that are sterile, abnormal or distracted.

When the triumphs of war inflame the mind, the philosophy of peace speaks to unlistening ears. Power silences reason, and the lust for conflict breaks the barriers of righteousness. It is an unequal contest between swords and syllogisms. The fairest breeze evokes no music from a harp with broken or discordant strings.

Therefore, every occasion of solemnity or joy is seized by the teacher to impart an appropriate lesson to minds made impressionable by the event celebrated. "A word fitly spoken is like apples of gold in pictures of silver."

Thus impressed, I come not to interest the old by reminiscences of the past, or the middle aged by discourse on the present, but to bear a message to the young whose eyes and hopes are set upon the future.

The college final is life's commencement. For the young men and young women who have finished their school studies to-day a new career begins. They stand at the edge of a forest into which they are about to plunge. As they proceed with wisdom or folly so shall they be happy or miserable. If they have any conception of the solemnity of this hour, what I shall say will not be commonplace to them, however it seems to others. The modest guide post which cannot claim a glance from the experienced traveler, deeply interests him who is a stranger to the road.

Young women and young men! Do not consider your schooling as completed. The end of college days is the beginning of a new education, in which the study of man in the practical affairs of life makes up the entire curriculum. Do not look upon the world as holding the prizes for which you must seek. Success in life depends, not upon what youth finds in the world, but upon what he brings to it. And what is that success, to achieve which you have studied here and are content to toil

hereafter? Nothing is more important to consider, for if you proceed blindly or erroneously you will realize too late in bitterness and sorrow the truths which the experience of others makes so plain to those who have the wit to learn.

Success is not synonymous with riches, or power, or fame. It may embrace one or more, or all of these, but who sets either, or all, as his goal, will grow heartweary in the quest and be heartsick even when the end sought is attained. Let me not be misunderstood as preaching a gospel of poverty, servility or indifference. On the contrary, I hold riches, power and fame in high esteem as ornaments and utilities of life. They are aids to success, but must not be confounded with it.

The most appalling evil which pervades society is the disposition to make riches the one great object of effort and sacrifice. From the earliest times sages have pointed out the folly, the misery and the sinfulness of this disposition. The uniform testimony of those who have thus devoted their lives is against it, and yet men and women, generation after generation, with apparently incurable fatuity, pay any price for mere wealth. Health, peace, contentment, domestic happiness, reputation, aye even honor, are all thrown into the scale to make the weight demanded for riches, which, when acquired, cannot repurchase what has been paid for them, or secure other goods to take their place.

If Robinson Crusoe on his lonely isle had exhausted his strength, undermined his health and denied himself recreation in order to build more habitations than he required, his folly would have been patent; but how few can see that beyond a certain point riches are as useless in the busy haunts of men as superfluous habitations would have been to the famous castaway. Wealth is desirable enough as a means, but to make it the end of existence is the supremest folly. A strong arm is also desirable, but to make it abnormally so involves waste of time and effort, besides impairment of the general vigor.

So uniform and universal is the proof that great wealth is an unworthy and disappointing end that few are willing to proclaim the acquisition thereof as their life purpose. But many

delude themselves and strive to delude others by the avowal that wealth is sought as a "stepping-stone to higher things." Of these the most prominent are power and fame—the twin vanities which lure men from the paths of virtue and happiness. Power weighs heavily enough upon him who by reason of his fitness has it imposed upon him, it overwhelms him who is vainglorious enough to seek it. A wise king once said that "whoever knew the weight of a sceptre would not stoop to pick it up, though he saw it lying on the ground."

And why should men seek fame when history so clearly proves that the only fame worth having ever eludes those who pursue it and flies to those whose deeds are prompted by duty alone?

I hold it true that whoever deserves the good opinion of his fellowmen desires it. In praise he recognizes the sanction of his life by those who are influenced or affected thereby. But such a man does not shape his course to catch the popular breeze, or fancy himself great because he has attained an ephemeral celebrity or won public office. He does not forsake the paths of peace, and the pleasures of home save when duty calls. The strenuous life is lived by him with courage when it is imposed by duty, but he does not seek it for its vain rewards. He distinguishes wisely between the patriot in arms and the soldier of fortune.

Only by ascertaining the true mission of life, devoting every energy to its fulfilment and subordinating thereto all meaner things, is happiness attainable, and happiness is success.

The true mission of a woman is to be wife and mother; of a man to be husband and father. In that proposition is contained all of the rights and duties of both sexes, and the key to human happiness. It is the law of animated nature, the precept of philosophy, the command of religion.

The uplifting of woman from the ignominious station to which she was assigned in ancient and darker ages; her induction into the fields of science, literature and art; her participation in the conduct of bread-winning industries, have not relieved her of the obligations or shorn her of the privileges

which hallow and crown her. Woman is no longer regarded as man's slave, plaything or divinity. From these conditions she has been freed by the broadening civilization of these later days. But her emancipation must not be misunderstood or misapplied. She affronts her own dignity by any imitation of the habits and conduct peculiar to man, for in that she confesses the superiority against which she so earnestly protests. In the highest development of her own faculties along natural lines lies her mission of honor, usefulness and happiness. Though her increasing strength of mind and body enables her to enter fields that her predecessors never trod; though she shine in the learned professions and win laurels in book-making, painting and sculpture, yet remains she a woman glorified alike by the limitations and the privileges of her sex. If she pursues any calling or career which disqualifies her from her real mission, she subordinates the higher to the lower purposes of life and makes that the end which should be only the means.

The devotees of art are wont to prate of art for art's sake, as if it were some deity to be worshiped in preference to others that are recognized. I confess I have never appreciated this doctrine, if it may be so designated, and it has always struck me as a weak and vain attempt to escape those obligations to God and society which rest alike upon the peasant and the poet, the hewer of wood and the sculptor.

So, too, we hear occasionally of women who set up art, science, literature, or even philanthropic work, to be worshiped and who set aside all considerations of family as impediments to success. I pity all such women. Though they suffer their minds to deal with problems only of vast, universal or infinite importance, though they toy with unfathomable mysteries and fancy that with rhetorical flashes they can make clear the darkness which the steady light of wisdom cannot penetrate, they miss the greatest of all lessons and lose the greatest of life's compensations. The abnormal aspirations of such a woman have blinded her to the light of love and made her deaf to the music of infant voices. They have shrunk her soul to the narrowness of her own purposes and left no room for God's.

There is no education too high for a woman. There is no equipment, physical, mental or moral, too great for the office of wife and mother, and if she qualifies herself to be self-supporting she will the more highly esteem relations into which she is not forced by her helplessness. What I plead for in the training of woman is fitness for her career as a woman—not fitness merely to compete with men.

What I have said in regard to the gentler sex is the opinion of most women and all men. The same reasoning upon which that opinion is based applies with equal force to man.

Lord Bacon stands almost alone among great thinkers in his opinion that marriage is an impediment to greatness, and his statement that the greatest deeds have been performed by men who had not charged themselves with wives and children, he fails to support with examples or authority.

Lucretius holds that the civilization of mankind resulted from marriage and the family relation, and Horace regarded the contempt into which home and family had fallen as the fountain-head of all the ills that fell on Rome. Juvenal's famous invective was not against marriage, but against the corrupt women of his time.

A recent American law writer of high ability, after deep research, concludes that "Marriage is a relation divinely instituted for the mutual comfort, well-being and happiness of both man and woman, for the proper nurture and maintenance of offspring and for the education in turn of the whole human race;" and again, that "in the family, rather than individualism, we find the incentive to accumulation, and in the home the primary school of the virtues, private and public." "Marriage," says Sir James McIntosh, "is the fit nursery of the commonwealth." History abundantly proves that the civilization of a nation can be measured by the home life of its people. The home gives effectiveness to religion, tone to social life, stability to government and nourishment to the arts. It engenders worship of God, devotion to country, love for our fellow-men and the self-uplifting to higher and better things not otherwise obtainable.

Nomads never progress far in civilization. They have no

homes in the true sense of that term. The downfall of Greece and Rome in ancient times, and of France in the last century, was due, in each instance, to a misconception or disregard of the home life.

You young men are rich in health, youth, energy, courage, intelligence, education and ambition. Perhaps you think with such wares you may aspire to some great destiny in which the home or family plays none, or an incidental part. If so, I would suggest that the consensus of opinion for many centuries upon a question of the kind under consideration is disregarded only by a temerity which shades into folly. Moreover, among the matured men within your acquaintance are many who in their youth possessed the same equipment in which you now rejoice. They had their wares; observe what disposition they made thereof and the results. If you study their lives with half the zeal and intelligence you have bestowed upon your books, you will learn lessons of priceless value.

You will learn how true it is that the wastefulness of youth makes the want of later years, and that this applies equally to riches, health and mental force.

You will learn that the intemperate habits which are laughed at as the permissible follies of youth, even when discontinued before they become fixed, yet leave in wasted vitality and a debased moral sense their enduring mementoes.

You will learn that youth with its energy and courage, be they never so great, steadily recedes before the conquering advance of Time, and that the pleasures which were mistaken for happiness mockingly desert their old victims to seek the new.

You will learn that he who chased the flying form of fame fell panting in the race dishevelled, bruised and spent, while to the misery of failure were added the jeers of the amused onlookers.

You will learn that he who made riches his one objective point, either failed to attain it; or worse still, made the difficult ascent only by throwing away, in whole or part, health, peace,

friends, self-esteem and the joys of domestic life. You will learn that he lost the grain of life for its golden husk.

You will learn that the boasted freedom of him who hath not wife or children is so hateful to the possessor that he will counsel all his friends to that sweet bondage, the avoidance of which was his undoing.

You will learn further that though a man has achieved everything else for which he strove, but has failed in the home and family life, he has not found happiness; that if he has succeeded in the home life, the pain of failure in this or that endeavor soon gave way to his enduring joys.

If reflection convinces you that the true mission of man is to be husband and father; to establish and maintain a perfect home and to be the competent head of a worthy family, you will have a market for your wares—a definite goal for your ambition—a purpose to attain which you can and should begin work at once. Do not underestimate the task.

You must determine at no distant date where you will establish yourself. In making your decision, keep in view your future home and family life. Do not be content because you are a young man, with a location unsuitable for such a home life as you aspire to. Study the climate, the healthfulness, the beauty and productiveness of the region, and the moral and intellectual tone of its people. Examine the county records and the court dockets. If you find that the people are not home-owners and that the dockets are crowded with divorce suits, go elsewhere.

Having located, address yourself seriously to whatever calling you have chosen. Make yourself master of it, and pursue it with industry and fidelity. Returns will soon follow proper effort. Then will come great dangers. The first successes are apt to make youth think that the future struggles will be light. He too often becomes intoxicated thereby and not only loses the fruit of victory, but relaxes his vigilance and wastes his reserve forces. Thus the untrained captain, unmindful of the long strong line of battle which lies ahead, fancies that he has routed the enemy by driving back a few skirmishers.

Let one success be a step to the next and push on. Be eco-

nomical. That home which you have in view will be humble or stately, bare or beautiful, according to your means, and unless you be economical your earnings will not grow and your patrimony will not remain.

When recruits are mustered in the officers impress upon them the importance of caring for their health. It belongs, say they, not to the soldier, but to his country, and it is as much the soldier's duty to preserve it as his arms and ammunition. Your health does not belong to you alone. It belongs also to your country, to society, and above all, to your family. Your vital forces will decrease from day to day according to your consumption thereof. They are limited to the requirements of temperate life. If your labors, your habits, or your pleasures be abnormal, those forces will not only be prematurely exhausted, but their quality degraded. The glow of modern life is too often secured by burning it up. We study anatomy and physiology in a perfunctory manner and only learn that we have stomachs and nerves when their derangement is accomplished.

But industry, economy and health do not complete the qualifications which are required of you. Between the home and its social and political surroundings the most intimate relations exist. If society be debased or benighted, the moral and intellectual tone of its constituents will be affected thereby. Therefore, the uplifting and betterment of your social environment is your right and duty.

The precious rights of life, property and liberty are guaranteed by our State and our country. To insure the purity and wisdom of public laws, and the efficient and just enforcement thereof is not less the concern of the citizen than his own private affairs. The citizen participates alike in the glory and disgrace, the impotence and greatness of his country. From the individual to the nation flow the power, virtue and wisdom it enjoys, and to the individual these are returned in the blessings of order, protection and progress "as the sea returns to the rivers in rain." These reciprocal obligations require every man to be active for the public good in peace and war. Not active in exploitation of the public coffers, not active to secure power

and glory for their own sakes, but active as patriots rendering the service that is due simply because it is due.

In the ideal home to which every true man should aspire, all the virtues must unite. The wife and mother must bring the graces, the patience, the purity and the piety which make her domestic throne a shrine; the husband and father must bring the high qualities which distinguish the good citizen, the patriot, and the man of righteousness and honor. Solomon has described the woman; David the man.

In nothing is man so eloquent as in setting forth the attractive virtues of woman. As son, lover, husband or sire, he lays at her feet the tributes of praise. But alas! too seldom is the tribute of words accompanied by the tribute of conduct. If we exalt woman for her patient industry, her self-sacrificing devotion, her tender ministrations and her chastity, and cast her off for want of these, we find justification in the requirements of family and society. Nor can the justice of this be denied. The sternness with which we avert our faces from the unworthy woman measures our esteem for her who is not. But this justice, if exact, is not impartial. The family and society make no demands upon one sex which should not be asserted against the other. They are not enforced with equal severity, it is true, but this is due to a perversion of rights and not to a difference between them. The man who renders himself unfit for his holy mission as husband and father is as culpable as the woman who does like violence to her duty as wife and mother. To set a high standard for woman compliments her; to set a like standard for ourselves glorifies her. To make ourselves worthy of the virtues we require in her is the only just recognition thereof, and the only rational basis of union. The perfect union is not between the indulgent angel and the flattering sinner, but between two thoughtful serious persons, having in mind their mutual obligations and resolute to fulfil them. In poetry and romance the beauty of love is made holy; in the happy home the holiness of love is made beautiful. Considerations such as these should govern in forming the marriage relation. Upon man more than upon woman rests the responsibility for results.

Immemorial custom confers upon him the initiative; nature and training have made him the stronger. He must not stop at a careful inventory of the contributions which will be made to the home by her who is to preside over it; he must examine his own. They cannot be too many or too great. Indeed, they rarely are enough. He is strangely free from man's infirmities who is altogether worthy of a woman's honor and a woman's love. He is indeed remarkable among his kind if he can be set up as a model for those to whom he has transmitted life. To be such a model is manifest duty, and brings manifest compensations. "In the place of the sires there shall their children be." You upon whose childhood and youth so much pains have been given by the parents now already nearing the close of their days, are what your parents made you. They are responsible for you, and as you reflect credit or discredit upon the home from which you came, so are they rejoiced or saddened. Like responsibilities will rest on you hereafter. Young as you are, it is not too soon to think of them. Grapes do not grow from thorns. The life you live is the life you will transmit; the habits of your life will be examples for your offspring.

In your recent examinations, if you have been faithful students, you have not exhibited superficial proficiency as the result of extraordinary efforts during the few weeks preceding the close of the session, but have demonstrated that throughout the term you have been training your minds by assiduous application to your studies. The diploma which does not mean that is worthless.

The preparation for your career in life should proceed in the same way. You cannot degrade your person, your morals and your mind by intemperance, debauchery and debasing associations and expect in future years to suddenly qualify yourselves for the home and family life. If you have the elements of success you stand ready to make every sacrifice which success demands, and you will with fidelity bend every energy and faculty to making yourself fit physically, mentally and morally not only to be a good citizen, a noble patriot, an able exponent of your vocation, an upright and honorable man, but to

be all of these and more, the worthy husband and father. That is the successful life.

This is all very trite. So are the Ten Commandments. So is the Declaration of Independence. So is the Constitution of our country. In the name of that country, its honor and its happiness, I beg you as factors in the destiny thereof turn not away from the truth because it is not new. On the contrary, let new ideas like strangers, while received with hospitality, be held under suspicion until they have proven their claim to your confidence.

Modern civilization engenders new thought, but not new principles of right. The coining of phrases results in counterfeits unless they contain the metal of truth. Nero acquired no immortality because his courtiers called him a god. The Creator did not cease to exist when the French abolished Him, and the Decalogue cannot be repealed by men or nations. Not destiny, but God, reigns, not might, but right, is the proper rule of conduct.

It is because in these days so many time-honored principles have been assailed by insidious sophistry or brazen power that I have been impelled to employ this opportunity to assert and defend your true mission. Cupidity, ambition, and the brutal instinct of combativeness, under euphemistic titles, invite you to barter your precious wares for worthless trinkets. You are told that we of this age have outlived the traditions of our fathers; that religion is an exploded superstititon; that victory is better than honor; that aggression is the mark of courage; that the duty of power is to dominate and spoliate the weak; that in the downfall of others is to be found our own uplifting; that to tread the paths of peace and the orderly development of home is to lead a life of ignoble ease.

Against such heresies I come to enter my earnest if humble protest. Let us learn wisdom from the nations whose greatness was destroyed by their crimes. Let us learn anew that the vent for our talent and energies is not in the strenuous life which nourishes itself by preying on others, but in that other and better life which takes sustenance from Nature's swelling breast; that the

virtue of the citizen is the source of social and national greatness, and that this virtue is fostered, not in the camp of the conqueror, not on the rostrum of the demagogue, not in the counting-room of syndicates, but in the home. Happy the man, happy the woman, who grasps these truths—for they shall find that the family is a dynasty, the home a kingdom, the fireside a throne.

FLAG PRESENTATION.

May 21st, 1898.

"COLONEL RICHE, OFFICERS AND PRIVATES OF THE GALVESTON REGIMENT: The name which your regiment bears is honored wherever commerce has planted the seed or garnered the harvests of civilization. It stands for success wrested by energy from refractory environments. It stands for a city already in the front rank of the world's great seaports, and famous everywhere for the virtue of its citizens. These, from the oldest to the youngest, are proud to be Galvestonians. In the nature of things, they could not all be here to-night, but this magnificent gathering is here to represent them, and through me to deliver an appropriate message. From the center of this community, quivering from the throbs of a vast commerce, to the suburbs where the cotter's humble home is glorified by domestic happiness, our people greet you and speed you with one voice and one heart. (Applause.) Some long for peace, some thirst for war, but all are for our country. (Enthusiastic applause.) The differences among us preceding this conflict are laid aside, and we all now read in the success of our arms a new epoch of justice, humanity and freedom. (Renewed cheering.)

"You will soon go forth to encounter the hardships and perils of war. You go consecrated by our name and inspired by the love of a country, great because her sons fatten her with their thrift in peace and protect her with their valor in strife.

"To your safeguarding in this time of trial our people—your people—have directed me to give this sacred emblem of our nation's sovereignty. (Tremendous cheering.) This is the massage which I bear.

"I cannot express in words the hopes and fears of humanity as reflected in these stars and stripes, but I venture to tell you

that conditions of the trust we impose upon you in delivering this flag to your keeping.

"To you is allotted the duty of not only preserving the already splendid military record of this city and this state, but also of adding new luster to the time-worn page. On the historic plain of San Jacinto our fathers made the enemy remember the massacres of Goliad and Alamo. (Applause.) If you be worthy sons of such sires; if you be fit guardians, when you plant or carry it in 'the red front of war' you will make the Spaniards remember the reconcentrados and the Maine. (Prolonged cheering.)

"We expect you to bring back this token of our confidence; but not as bright and as glossy and symmetrical as now. It may be full of rents and flutter to the breeze in smoke-stained patches, but it will be all the dearer because of the rents and stains that shall tell us where it has been. We will read your records in the wounds it bears. (Applause.) They will assure us that when the awful din and carnage of grim war put you to the supremest test you guarded our flag with unshrinking breasts, and carried it forward with resistless arms. We will know that you planted this standard in lands where God's softest breezes have waited so long to make the music of freedom by playing with its folds. (Cheers.) That hour has come, for nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that the colonial victims of Spain's misgovernment shall be free. (Applause.)

"But not alone must you be valorous under this banner. Be effectively so. There is honor, it is true, in fighting to the death even though the fight be lost. Such honor even our enemies claim; but as for you, remember that as Americans and as Texans your traditions and your history require you not only to fight, and if need be to die, but above all, to fight and win. (Applause.)

"Be cool as well as courageous, resolute as well as gallant; immovable in defense, irresistible in attack. Where this flag waves let foeman find the unyielding pluck which neither time nor torture can subdue. (Cheers.)

"But you are charged with doing credit to this flag in other scenes besides those of battle. There are duties of the camp as well of the field. You must endure privations, fatigue, menial labor, hunger and pestilence. Upon the demeanor of this regiment in these relations rests also the honor of this banner, and so I say, if there be one among you, officer or private, who has not in cold blood, with a sedate mind, resolved to faithfully obey every command to which he is amenable, and to patiently bear all the ills which I have mentioned, let him not profane this standard by daring to march beneath it.

"Galveston expects every man to do his duty. (Enthusiastic applause.) You recognize the sentiment (renewed cheering) and recall the occasion when it thrilled the world. Let us draw inspiration from it. It came from our kindred across the sea, when they fronted the same foe who faces us now. Forgotten are enmities which divided us from England in days gone by. We only remember that we are of one blood and animated by the same aspirations for freedom, justice and fair play. (Prolonged cheering.)

"The sturdy speech which is common to them and to us is never so much in tune as when it tells of deeds like Waterloo or Trafalgar. Boys, I charge you to carry this flag so there will be new and not less glorious themes for song and story in our mother tongue. (Applause.) I do not doubt you will. Nor do I doubt that when this cruel war is over the whole world will listen to our words when we sing the homely lines which our English brethren have made into a classic:

"We do not want to fight,
But, by jingo, if we do,
We've got the men, we've got the ships,
And we've got the money too."
(Much cheering.)

"Some of you will never return in the flesh. In this crisis, for many of you will be snapped the link which unites the yesterday without beginning and the to-morrow without end. We

sorrow already in anticipation of the fearful price which must be paid for liberty and justice. But it has been ever so, and now as always, it must and will be paid from the treasures of American valor. (Applause.)

"One word more: you will teach anew in battle how Americans can fight and win and the lesson will be written in blood. But you will meet others besides the armed foe. Prisoners, non-combatants, helpless women and children will be encountered while your blood is still afire with the fury of conflict. In such solemn moments look at this flag and remember that our fame rests on your deeds. You are Americans and gentlemen, and you will teach the world that as such you have only lead and steel for contending foes, but for all the rest the tender care and protection of brave men. (Prolonged applause.)

"Take this flag, with all its inspirations and its burdens—take it with our prayers. 'May the Eternal bless you and guard you. May He cause His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you.' And through your valor may our country soon conquer a peace that shall open for us a new and enduring era of freedom and justice in which all the world may share." (Prolonged cheering.)

ADDRESS ON HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION.

In the common disposition to acquire knowledge respecting matters far removed, we are not a little prone to overlook more important truths that lie immediately before us. The eye which is fixed upon some distant point does not comprehend in the scope of its vision the most proximate objects. It is this same mental idiosyncrasy that makes us overwise regarding the future, and over-foolish regarding the present. We have all heard learned and plausible prophecies as to the future destiny of a country, the present status of which was a sealed book to the prophet. And recurring to my first statement, who has not heard the pedant tell of the fauna and flora of Africa, Asia or Europe, without being able to give the correct names of the modest flowers or musical birds that grace his own garden. The habits of the house cat are unexplored mysteries to many who can discourse learnedly about the polar bear. The Bible, that nearest and dearest of books, is even among many who pass for intelligent and cultivated, best known by hearsay.

When I protested against making any remarks upon so threadbare a theme as our organic law, the gentleman who invited me to address you assured me that the field was ripe unto the harvest. It was confidently stated that very few of the average Americans could tell with any accuracy how our Presidents were elected. Such statements startled me at first, but a little investigation convinced me of their correctness. I have found young men and young women, too, who know more about the Republics of Greece than of the one under which they live. I have found others who know all about *Magna Charta,* and very little about the Declaration of Independence. I have talked with native Americans who know as little about the true development of our nation as they do about the rise of some ancient dynasty whose history has been lost to the world.

Having learned all this I have not only become reconciled to my task, but I am pleased with it. It is true it offers no scope for originality, unless I ignore the objects of these meetings. But upon reflection I hold that originality is oftener a curse than a blessing, especially to those upon whom it is inflicted. And after all the best originality is not the discovery of new truths, but the correct application of old truths to new conditions. It is with truth as with the Cereals. The world is not so much concerned in discovering new varieties, as in increasing the acreage and harvests of those already known. If I can drop a seed in fallow soil tonight and make it germinate one blade of knowledge; if, to change the metaphor, I can direct a single mind to the study of the genius of our government, it matters not to me that the means have been made to my hand by others.

I shall not attempt to discuss the constitution of the United States, upon any presumption that it is familiar to us. When I was invited to appear before you, the courteous bearer of the invitation indulged the presumption that I knew all about the subject, and my promised audience nothing. There was some considerable violence to truth in this idea, but just where I will not undertake to say. Suffice that I have adopted one part of it. I shall treat the subject as if you knew nothing about it. In doing so, I feel sure I shall be wide of the mark; not more so, however, than you will be in adopting the other part. In any event we will both be safe. If you hear an "oft told tale," its merit will save it from your harsher judgment; and if my knowledge be very limited, at least what I shall say will be correct, because I shall speak by, if not from the books.

Within the limits I have prescribed for myself, it will be necessary for me to treat the subject cursorily, because anything like a comprehensive history of the constitution would carry the treatment beyond my ability to discuss and your capacity to endure.

It would necessitate a complete review of American history, prior to the constitution. This would involve the consideration of the Declaration of Independence, and the causes which led to its adoption. We would have to examine into the separate charters of each of the thirteen colonies and the governmental systems pre-

vailing in each. We would be required to study the articles of confederation and the revolutionary war, and then we would but have done the prefatory work. There would remain the constitutional convention, the legislative debates, the constitutional amendments, the rise of political parties, the radical differences of construction, the late war and the era of reconstruction. Whole libraries have been written about this remarkable constitution, so that it would tire you to have read to you only the titles of the works treating of it.

We must content ourselves with a mere mention of the most salient points—

The thirteen original states were before the adoption of the constitution distinct colonies, each existing under a distinct charter from the crown of England. Privileges granted and restrictions imposed in some of these charters were altogether or partly omitted from others. They were all dependents on the King of England; they were all inhabited by people of English birth or descent; in all, English was the common language; to all or nearly all, the savage was a common foe and Europe a common field for commerce. Upon all, England, through parliament, sought to impose and did impose burdens, which at first excited separate complaint, and afterwards united protest; which led first to resistance by one and finally to revolt by all.

But while the colonies had so many interests in common, there were not a few circumstances in which their interests were distinct or hostile. In some fishing, ship building and shipping were chief industries; in others, manufactures and in still another class, agriculture. In some the slave was deemed a necessity; in others where he was not required, slavery was an abomination. The colonies were of different dimensions, population, climate and local situation. They were naturally jealous of one another, and it required in the first instance a great common danger to relegate to a second place the manifold differences which bristled among them in opposition to union. That common danger was the threatened tyranny which England was seeking to establish in the regulation of Colonial affairs.

In 1765 parliament passed the "stamp act." This was followed

by other despotic measures and the mutters of a coming storm were heard by those who knew the temper of the colonists. Still there was no mention of resistance by actual force. Patrick Henry in 1765 defined in the Virginia assembly, the rights of the colonies to make their own laws and impose their own taxes. He was the great Home Ruler of his day. Following the Virginia assembly came that of Massachusetts, which proposed a congress of the colonies. The proposition met with favor and in October, 1765, the congress convened at New York. It breathed a spirit of loyalty to Great Britain that gave no promise of the outbreaks so soon to follow. This congress indeed enjoys its greatest significance from the fact that it showed the colonies that by such conventions they could unite for their common welfare.

After the parliamentary attack on the charter of Massachusetts in 1774, Virginia suggested and Massachusetts called the second convention of the colonies. It is commonly called the first Continental Congress, because the one held in 1765 was so meagerly attended as to hardly deserve the title. The congress of 1774 was attended by the representatives of twelve of the thirteen colonies, Georgia alone not being represented.

This congress again respectfully *addressed* the crown, but there was an unmistakable undertone, which was clearly audible. It was prominent in two measures adopted. One was the articles of association, in which a plan was matured, by which everything English was to be boycotted (as we would now say). The other was an expression in favor of the resistance made by Massachusetts to English aggressions and the implied promise of support if force were offered by England to subdue the opposition. Trouble was anticipated from these measures and the delegates foreseeing it did not adjourn *sine die*, but to meet again in May, 1775.

In April, 1775, the conflict at Lexington occurred and the first blood was shed in the struggle for liberty.

When the congress met on May 10, 1775, the condition had arisen which recalled the implied promise made to Massachusetts eight months previous. The pledge was not forgotten nor violated. An army was recognized, rather than organized, as the American Continental Army. George Washington was chosen to

command it and his commission as commander in chief was issued on June 17, 1775, the very day on which was fought the battle of Bunker Hill. But all this time there was only resistance, not revolt. On the contrary, while fighting battles, equipping war vessels, issuing paper money and exercising all the prerogatives of a nation, the idea of independence was protested against with horror.

But in January, 1776, Thomas Paine's common sense pamphlet openly advocated Independence. It met a warm welcome everywhere in America, and the course of events strengthend its popularity. In June Richard Henry Lee moved his famous resolution, and on July 4, 1776, Congress adopted the masterpiece of Thomas Jefferson, the Declaration of Independence. This was the birthday of the United States as declared by the highest Court in the land.

You will observe that this Congress was composed of delegates from distinct sovereignties and that no form, however crude, had been adopted for managing the common affairs of the colonies. They met like so many allies in a common war. It was not until near the close of 1777, that this Congress adopted the articles of Confederation, and these were not acceptable to New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland.

If we had time, it would prove profitable to examine in detail this first expedient at government. It was a lamentable failure. It contained no element of cohesion, except that which proceeded from the danger of war. When that was pressing there was some unity of action among the colonies; when it was removed even temporarily, Congress was treated with indifference or contempt. So weak indeed was this semblance of a government that our independence may be attributed rather to the unpopularity of the war in England, than to the vigorous efforts of the colonies. It may surprise you to learn that at no time did England have more than 33,000 troops engaged in the Revolutionary war and these were in a large measure mercenaries. In 1782 the war ended and in 1783 a treaty of peace was entered into.

All danger from without being ended the troubles at home began. Peace brought on the greatest crisis of the Western

world. The colonists who bared their bosoms to the bullet for the sake of liberty, could not be stirred to enthusiasm to preserve it. The people and the country were poor to a degree that was painful. Commerce was at a standstill, agriculture had more or less been neglected, and now the citizen turned wearily from the public cares to provide for the pressing needs of himself and family. The tax gatherer was treated with contempt or violence, and the government's treasury was empty. The troops were clamoring for pay and the officers for rewards. They cried for bread and Congress could only offer stones. Liberty degenerated into license and the prevailing discontent among the soldiers and the indifference among the civilians offered, but two apparent alternatives, anarchy or a King. Washington was urged to accept a crown, and doubtless he could have established a dynasty had he not put aside the temptation between him and the popular freedom for which he had fought so ably and endured so much.

The only escape from the alternative named was in another and stronger scheme of government, in which liberty should be protected by power, adequate for its preservation against attack from within or without. To attain such a scheme seemed well nigh impossible. Difficulties unnecessary to mention stood in the way of a Convention and it was only by an accident that one was assembled.

The navigation of Chesapeake Bay was the subject of a conference between Maryland and Virginia in 1785, the delegates meeting at Washington's residence. At this meeting Maryland proposed a convention of the colonies for the regulation of commerce. It met at Annapolis in 1786 and proved a failure, but when it adjourned another convention was recommended by it, to meet at Philadelphia in May, 1787. Congress approved the call, and just eleven years after Congress at Philadelphia had declared the colonies free, the great convention assembled at Philadelphia to insure their liberty by establishing their Union.

The constitutional convention was not a large body of men. There were only fifty-five delegates, but every delegate was an intelligent giant. The choicest spirits of the colonies were assembled in the solemn consideration of an instrument upon the suc-

cessful completion of which hung the destiny of the Western Hemisphere. If the supreme importance of their labors had escaped their conception, they might well have been forgiven. They could not in the nature of things know the extent or resources of the vast domain to be directly affected by the government they were to upbuild; and even in a much smaller degree were they acquainted with the great territory to the south wherein the seed of liberty would quicken into life under the influence of our successful revolt against monarchy. But they did comprehend in a vague way, all that the century has brought to pass. There were minds there assembled, who looked forward with confidence to the time when from the Arctic ocean to Cape Horn there would be no government that was not based, broad and deep, upon the popular will. That hour has come to pass. Our neighbors to the north are free to part company with England, if they chose so to do, and to the south the last crown took flight to Europe on the vessel that carried Pedro from a country which, much as it loved that great and good ruler, loved liberty yet more.

The delegates represented a constituency about one-twentieth of the present population of the United States. They represented people whose entire commerce even figured per capita was trifling compared to that which now exists. No human intellect could foretell the changes that have occurred, but that changes would occur, and that they would be momentous was deemed a foregone conclusion. These great men dealt with the problems before them with great earnestness and deliberation. They knew the responsibilities which rested upon them, and their labors in discharge thereof extended over a period of four months and three days.

George Washington of Virginia presided. Among the delegates were James Madison of Virginia, afterwards President of the United States; Edmund Randolph, afterwards Secretary of State; Benjamin Franklin and the two Morris' from Pennsylvania; Rufus King and Elbridge Gerry of Massachusetts; Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth of Connecticut, the latter afterwards being the chief justice of the United States; Alexander Hamilton of New York; Paterson of New Jersey and the Pinck-

neys and John Rutledge of South Carolina. In any convention composed of such material, whatever the business before it, a variety of views would be looked for, and every opinion would have able champions. In the constitutional convention, aside from the marked individuality of the delegates, there were many causes and grounds of difference. I have already mentioned some of them. I shall pass by all of those that were finally set at rest without making too marked an impression on our governmental chart. There were some contentions, however, that cannot be passed by without losing the lights by which the constitution must be studied.

The first wrangle arose over the basis of representation in Congress. The large states desired only a single legislative body, which should be chosen with reference only to population, and be clothed with the power of making laws and appointing all leading officers. This was called the large State plan, because it would manifestly give the large states the controlling voice in national affairs. It is worthy of observation that New York, now the most populous of the States, was then among the small states, and at one time her delegates withdrew from the convention in anger, because they thought the small states were not receiving fair treatment. The small states also wanted a single house, but insisted that each state, without reference to size or population, should have an equal voice in the national matters. A deadlock ensued, and the situation had to be relieved by the first great compromise. Congress was made to consist of two bodies, in one of which (the House of Representatives) the large state plan prevailed, and in the other of which (the Senate) the small state plan was adopted. The manner of electing the president after repeated efforts was also reached by a similar compromise. The second great contention arose over the slave trade, and this was also settled by an agreement that the traffic should not be interfered with for twenty years.

The third great difference grew out of the representation from slave-holding states. This was also composed by the famous compromise which gave to the slave states representation for three-fifths of the slaves. In passing I may remark that the basis

of representation required an enumeration of the people, and thus was inaugurated for the first time in modern governments a systematic census. When we reflect what wise lessons are drawn from statistics, we wonder why in modern times it was only as an incidental necessity that a census was provided for. The greatest statesman of any age, Moses, had a census thousands of years before, but his example was neglected in this respect, as his precepts in many others have been disregarded.

It will be seen that the constitution was not the creation of a single mind. Indeed, it was no creation at all. It grew as it were from the friction of the many intellects engaged in its consideration. It was an evolution which proceeded during the whole summer of 1787, and when the end was reached there was not perhaps a single delegate who voted for it who was wholly pleased with it. Each had been overruled upon some point and all had been constrained to leave, as unsettled, some questions that were then too critical to be touched. It was deemed wiser to defer until after times matters which, if then pressed to solution, would have wrecked the fabric of union. The Declaration of Independence proceeded from one brain and pen. It is a document written in enthusiasm and adopted in a like fever. It displays the want of calm deliberation; but the constitution is cold, dignified and indicative of the hard battles which were fought over nearly every word in it. While it was being formed the people regarded the convention with mild contempt. The fishermen of New England, the hunters of the West and the planters of the Middle and Southern States, as a rule, either ignored the action of the men who labored so long and so faithfully in their behalf, or sneered at their efforts to accomplish what was deemed almost impossible. At length the work was done and submitted to the Continental Congress with certain recommendations in reference to its adoption. The arbitrary provision for ratification of the constitution by nine of the states was carefully ignored, and Congress, fearful of its own powers, refused to do more in the premises than to send the constitution to the Colonial legislatures for consideration.

Then began the learned and exciting debates in which every

phase of the constitution was carefully analyzed. In every legislature the battle raged fiercely, and for a while the fate of the constitution hung in a critical balance. The newspapers teemed with able discussions, and many of these are still preserved as literary, political and legal classics. The efforts of Hamilton, Madison and Jay in the newspapers and pamphlets of the day have long since been gathered into a volume, in which the constitution is thoroughly analyzed, explained and defended. The work is known as the Federalist, and no higher praise can be accorded to it than to say that it is everywhere used as a text book on Constitutional law, and is regarded as authority in all our courts.

Nine states ratified the Constitution before New York or Virginia voted, and when these did vote the Constitution carried only by slender majorities. North Carolina refused in the first instance to ratify at all, and in Rhode Island it was not even considered. After its ratification by eleven states Congress proceeded to organize the new government, so far as it could. An election was ordered, and George Washington was chosen president and John Adams vice president. The inauguration took place March 4th, 1789, and in due time all of the departments were organized.

This in brief is an account of how the Constitution was framed and adopted. It remains but to state that the first ten amendments grew out of the legislative debates and were adopted in 1791, so shortly after the Constitution itself as to be considered almost a part of it from the beginning.

Let us now proceed to consider the Constitutional Amendments.

They are not voluminous. Over four months of steady labor by the able delegates assembled produced a work not exceeding 4,300 words. Over a century has passed since their deliberations ceased, and despite the vast changes in all conditions during that time we have added only about fifteen hundred words, making the total organic law, as it now exists, comprised within 7,000 words. When it is remembered that the first ten amendments were adopted almost with the Constitution, and grew out of the

discussion of the latter when submitted for ratification, we can appreciate the great foresight of those who framed our governmental system. Let us pause to make a few comparisons. The convention at Philadelphia represented a population of about three millions. Their system has endured successfully for a century, requiring practically only five amendments, and now is regarded with the highest favor, not only by the sixty millions who live under it, but by all the liberty loving people of the earth. The stage coach has given place to vestibuled trains; the canal boat to the fast steamboat; the lugger to the ocean greyhounds; the slow mails to the telegraph. All the material conditions and relations of life have been radically changed; a new civilization has replaced the old, but so well conceived was the Constitution, so well expressed, and its factors so nicely balanced that it has never been seriously suggested in all these years that altered conditions required any material change in the organic law.

In this state, formed with the United States as a model, we have in a little over fifty years had five constitutions, and to-day we are heartily dissatisfied with the one we have. The present Constitution of Texas is several times more voluminous than the National Constitution, and was designed to meet all the ills that flesh is heir to—and herein we see how its framers departed from the model set before them. Congress has only such powers as are granted by the Constitution; the legislature of the state has all the powers not denied by the State Constitution and the National Constitution, laws and treaties. The National Constitution is brief, leaving details of legislation to the changing requirements that may present themselves;—the State Constitution enters into details, as if no other body of men that should follow its framers would ever possess the patriotism or wisdom which characterized them. These latter, distrusting the people, ignored the fundamental principle of our government, while the framers of the National Constitution, jealous, as they were, of concentrating power, recognized this truth, that wherever the people so far forgot their rights and surrendered their liberty as to submit to an abuse of power, no written instrument, howsoever vo-

luminous or clear, could stay the rule of tyranny. Accordingly, they simply framed our system in its broadest outlines, leaving the details to develop themselves. The government was divided into three co-ordinate branches, each independent of the others, viz., the Legislative, Judicial and Executive branches. The first makes the laws, the second construes them, the third executes them.

The Constitution in which this division is made and the machinery of government provided is divided into a brief preamble and seven articles.

The first article relates exclusively to the legislative department; the second to the executive and the third to the judicial. The fourth deals with the States in their relations to one another and to the nation. The fifth makes provision for amending the Constitution. The sixth relates to the existing public debt, the supremacy of the national law and the oath of fealty. The seventh provides for the ratification of the Constitution by not less than nine states.

The first ten amendments were adopted in 1791; the 11th, in 1798; the 12th, in 1804; the 13th, in 1865; the 14th, in 1868, and the 15th, in 1870.

695

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

0 011 640 905 7